

The Social Science Bulletin

A REVIEW OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AT MISSISSIPPI STATE COLLEGE

November-December, 1950

Vol. IV, No. 2

FRANK L. OWSLEY: The Success Pattern of the Poor but Ambitious in the Old South	1
L. A. OLSON: The T. V. A. and the Land-Grant College	10
J. K. BETTERSWORTH: Battle of the "Bookfarmers"— Lee and the Defense of the Mississippi A. & M. College, 1882-1900	12
ESTHER A. SEGNER: Home Economics in Family Life Education	25

NOTES, EXTRACTS, AND ABSTRACTS

The Southern Country Store	9
The Columbia "Assembly" Plan	11
The National Municipal League Examines City Finances	24
Mississippi Prices and Business Activity, September - October, 1950	26
The Revised Public Affairs Curriculum	27
Workshop on Community Development	27
History Lecture Series	28
Church and Community Conference Plans	28
Agricultural History Seminar	28
Social Sciences in Experiment Station Conference	28
Economics Department Plans for Round Table	28
Activities	29-31
Publications	31



Published by

The Social Science Research Center

State College, Miss.

The Social Science Bulletin

VOLUME IV, NUMBER 2

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1950

Published by the Social Science Research Center of Mississippi State College. John K. Bettersworth, Chairman and Editor. All communications should be addressed to Box 148, State College. Office: Lee Hall, Room 206. Telephone: Starkville 900, Ex. 264. News items and other contributions are solicited.

The Social Science Research Center

John K. Bettersworth, Chairman

Harold F. Kaufman, Associate Chairman

The purpose of the Social Science Research Center is to stimulate coordination and cooperation among the social sciences at Mississippi State College and to encourage research in undeveloped areas of the social science field. The Center publishes Social Science Studies and The Social Science Bulletin. It also sponsors the Social Science Round Table, a cooperative activity in which social scientists and persons in related fields at Mississippi State College and neighboring institutions participate.

EDITORIAL NOTES

The Social Science Bulletin is publishing in December as a special edition a supplement containing a description of the academic curricula at Mississippi State College in Public Affairs (Business School), Social Science (Science School), Social Studies (Education School), Agricultural Economics and Administration (Agriculture School), and Graduate Studies. Copies of this supplement may be obtained by filling out the blank below.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

Please send _____ copies of your special supplement, "The Social Sciences at Mississippi State College: The Academic Program."

The Success Pattern of the Poor but Ambitious in the Old South

by

FRANK L. OWSLEY
University of Alabama

NOTE: The following paper was given by Dr. Owsley before the Social Science Round Table as the initial one of the James Wilfred Garner Lectures in History and Political Science.

British and Northern travelers--and some Southerners--who wrote about the South in the late antebellum period were of the opinion that the white inhabitants of the South fell into two classes--the slaveholders and the nonslaveholders. Moreover, they gave the impression that the typical slaveholder was a great planter living in a white-columned mansion, who wore a goatee and lounged on the shady veranda or under the magnolia trees and rose arbors, with a mint julep in one hand and a black-snake whip in the other; while a squad of obsequious and frightened slaves hovered in the background with fresh supplies of mint julep and fans made from turkey wings and peacock tails, with which they cooled the sweating brow of "de colonel" or scared off the flies when he became tipsy or felt too indolent to defend himself. The slaveholders thus classed as planters were invariably pictured as great monopolists, who, despite their love of ease were brothers under the skin of such robber barons of a later age as J. Gould and Commodore Vanderbilt. They were pictured as crowding every poor family off the fertile lands and even lands from which modest profits could be made; they dominated politics, religion, the public press, the learned professions, and all phases of public leadership and places of distinction. The six million nonslaveholders in 1860 were generally classed as poor whites, who had been pushed off by the slaveholders into the pine barrens and sterile sand hills and mountains. Here, as squatters upon abandoned land or the public domain, they dwelt in squalid log huts, and kept alive by hunting and fishing, and by growing patches of corn, sweet potatoes, collards and pumpkins in the small clearings they had made in the all-engulfing wilderness. They were to a great extent illiterate, shiftless, irresponsible, frequently vicious, and nearly always addicted to the use of rot-gut whiskey and dirt-eating. Many, perhaps a majority, according to later writers, had malaria, hookworm, pellagra, and other diseases due to dietary deficiencies and neglect. Between the Great Unwashed and the Slaveholders there was a chasm that could not be bridged. The nonslaveholders were six million supernumeraries in a slaveholding society.

The nonslaveholders thus described had reached their wretched condition of hopeless poverty and disease, according to such Northern travelers as Olmsted, or Southern writers like D. R. Hundley, because they were unwilling to perform any manual labor. Those from outside the South, like Olmsted, contended that the nonslaveholder would not work because physical labor was identified with slavery. I quote Olmsted: "For manual agricultural labor, the free man looking on, has a contempt, and for its necessity in himself, is such necessity exists, a pity quite beyond that of the man under whose observation it has been free from such association of ideas." Hundley and Southern writers generally, unlike the British and Northern writers, estimated the poor whites not as 6,000,000 but as only a few hundred thousand and laid their shiftlessness to congenital laziness, going back, perhaps, to the Garden of Eden before Adam and Eve were faced by the necessity of earning their living by the sweat of their faces. Let me quote you the description of Southern society left by the noted British economist, J.E. Cairnes, in his book, The Slave Power. Cairnes was writing from travel accounts rather than from personal observation, and his generalized picture may, therefore, be considered a synthesis of the pictures of the travelers and critics of the period. I quote Cairnes: "The constitution of a slave society resolves itself into three classes broadly distinguished from each other and connected by no common interest--the slaves on whom devolves all the regular industry, the slaveholders who reap all its fruits, and an idle and lawless rabble who live dispersed over vast plains in a condition little removed from absolute barbarism. These mean /or poor/ whites. . . are the natural growth of the slave system; regular industry is only known to them as the vocation of slaves, and it is the one fate which above all others they desire to avoid. In the Southern States no less than five million beings who have been expelled from the good lands by the slaveholders are now said to exist . . . in a condition little removed from savage life, eking out a wretched subsistence by hunting, fishing, by hiring themselves out for occasional jobs, by plunder."

Such a picture of society in a country such as we are acquainted with may seem absurd today—at least to a Southerner—but with some bleaching and slight modification, it was quite acceptable to the older generation of historians; and even yet such writers as Dwight Dumond and Allan Nevins are in fundamental agreement with it. But intensive research into the social and economic structure of the old South has revealed that the accounts of such writers as Olmsted and Cairnes—and Dumond and Nevins—though frequently accurate in detail, as was Uncle Tom's Cabin, for example, are completely unrealistic in their general concept of Southern society. An examination of the tax lists and manuscript census returns for the last two decades of the antebellum South, for about 100 sample counties in seven Southern States, reveals, not a simple society, composed of slaveholders, slaves, and poor whites, but a society of great complexity. There were in 1860 about 8,000,000 whites who lived in the slave states, and approximately 2,000,000 belonged to slaveholding families, while the remainder belonged to the nonslaveholding families. It is usually surprising to most of us to discover that 60 percent, or 1,200,000 of these slaveholders, owned from only one to five slaves, and that most of this sixty percent had farms of less than 150 acres. This group was definitely of the small farmer class. The next twenty percent, or about 400,000, had from five to ten slaves and seldom owned more than three hundred acres of land; and they were certainly not planters, and usually, not large farmers. The remaining twenty percent ranged from large farmers to great planters; but even the bulk of them owned less than thirty slaves and would be classed as small or moderately well-to-do-planters. Only about 40,000 of the two million slaveholders owned above fifty slaves, and many of these were not persons of great wealth, for, indeed, fifty slaves would seldom furnish twenty-five field hands.

We now come to the nonslaveholders, who comprised about 6,000,000 out of the 8,000,000 white inhabitants of the South. Were they poor whites, and were they living segregated in the sand hills and pine barrens? The answer is that, on the contrary, 4,500,000 were landowning farmers whose average holdings were in the class with the small slaveholders, that, indeed, they were of the same economic and social class as the small slaveholders. What of the segregation of the nonslaveholder as described by Cairnes? Outside of restricted areas such as the ricelands of the coast and the swampy river bottoms, where fortunes would have to be spent in draining and building levees, there was usually a thorough intermingling of the holdings of the planters, small slaveholders, and nonslaveholders. This is established by an examination of the tax books, which usually give the location of all landed property.

It will have been observed, perhaps, that I have been dealing with agricultural people, and of course the South was to a large degree devoted to agriculture. But there were at least 200,000 skilled artisans, small tradesmen, and owners and operators of small industries, such as sawmills, grist mills, brickyards, railroads and steamboats, most of whom were nonslaveholders living in urban areas. There were of course the professions, and business generally, where slaveholding was not important, unless, as was often the case, one also owned a farm or plantation in addition to following a profession. But they made up a relatively small part of the population.

Belaboring the point, in order to make it more comprehensible, and omitting figures, let it be repeated that the overwhelming majority of Southern whites in the old South were middle class people, not poor whites, that the society of the old South was essentially a society of freeholders.

Several questions now arise in connection with the topic of this paper, namely the success pattern of the poor but ambitious. First, how did more than six million persons out of eight million become freeholders? Second, how did a small freeholder become a large farmer and even a planter? Third, how did a poor young man become a member of the learned professions such as law, medicine, the ministry, and university or college teaching?

I will take up some of the answers and indicate others. First, how did the mass of rural Southerners become freeholders? If one considers the landed resources that available to the Southern people between the Revolution and the Civil War, it at once becomes clear why the majority of Southerners, slaveholders and nonslaveholders alike, were able to acquire the ownership of farms and plantations. A goodly portion of the Federal domain of over a billion and a quarter acres was open to Southerners during this period, and there were at least another two hundred millions acres of state lands open for settlement in Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Texas, Kentucky, and Tennessee. The opportunity of acquiring land was greater in the South than in the North. For example, as late as 1848, before the creation of Oregon Territory, the area of the states and organized territories of the South was more than twice as great as that of the North, whereas the population of the South, slave and free, was scarcely half that of the North. At all times during the interval between the Revolution and the Civil War the combined Federal and State public domains in the South were greater than those open to settlement in the North, and the popu-

lation was increasingly less than that of the North. During the same period the land policies of the state and Federal governments became more and more liberal, so that, in 1820, for example, one could purchase 100 acres of Federal land for \$125, and, after the graduation and swampland acts, for much less. Under the circumstances, an able-bodied and determined person could not fail to acquire a family sized farm, unless bedeviled by extraordinarily hard luck. Let me give a specific example of a young man, by the name of Ramsey, who migrated from Georgia to Mississippi and acquired a freehold of considerable size and large herds of cattle and swine.

Ramsey, who was poor, and in possession of very little if any cash, emigrated to Mississippi in 1808. The story is told by his son whose diary is now in the Department of Archives and History at Montgomery. The diary is a rare document, because the personal records of the plain folk have seldom been preserved. After a hazardous journey through the Indian country--the Ramseys reached Wayne County, Mississippi in the spring of 1808. The father immediately erected a log cabin, says the son in his diary, and cut down the canebrake and burned it, thus killing the timber and clearing the ground. With only a hoe for a tool, Ramsey planted his crop. "The planting," writes his son, "was done by making holes at proper distances, depositing the seed and covering it with earth taken out in making the hole. No fence nor plowing was necessary, all that it needed was to keep down the mutton cane and butter weed with the hoe. . . . But this preparation required time and labor," continues the son, "so that it was on the 4th of July father finished planting his corn and pumpkins. . . . although father was late in getting his corn in the ground, yet in gathering it in the fall, he not only made plenty for home consumption but a surplus for market. And as to his pumpkin crop, I recollect distinctly, to have heard him say repeatedly that he could walk all over the fields stepping on pumpkins." Ramsey in the meantime bartered for a spinning wheel and cotton, and made a loom. "With these facilities," writes the son, "rough and unhandy as they were, mother not only clothed the family but made a surplus for market which father in the fall of 1808 carried to Mobile and sold for \$2.50 per yard." Thus, at the end of the first year, as a squatter on the public domain, Ramsey sold corn and cloth for hard cash--gold or silver. At the end of the year he sold out his squatters rights--a cabin, a few acres of new ground, and some other improvements wrought by the hardest and most exacting labor--and moved a short distance in the neighborhood, where he and his family had become members of Bethel Church, Methodist Episcopal. Again Ramsey built a log house, burned the cane, killed the trees, and planted a considerable patch of corn, cotton, and garden truck. Again he sold his surplus in Mobile and to his neighbors, who were rapidly increasing. At the end of a year, he sold his squatter's rights and moved to another unsettled corner of the same neighborhood, thus acquiring a fresh addition to his small stock of cash. At this time, writes his son, Ramsey "appeared to take up the idea that improving new places and selling them out to other new comers (and there were many) was better for him, more money in it; than to remain in one place and make larger improvements on government land. By this method he hoped to acquire money sufficient to buy, or enter him a permanent home, when the government lands were put into the market; which he correctly anticipated would be at no distant day. On this place, father made improvements like unto his former ones, made one or two crops, and sold his squatter rights out again." Ramsey made two or three more similar moves, always staying in reach of Bethel Church, and each time sold surplus products of the field, range, and the loom, and disposed of his improvements on the public land for cash.

At last in 1815 Ramsey found the place he wished to make his permanent home, and by his hard and unremitting toil and that of his young family, he had accumulated sufficient cash to pay for a considerable tract of land and had acquired a large herd of cattle and swine. But it was not until 1817--nine years after coming to Mississippi--that he could obtain the land, for the Federal Government did not put it up for sale until that year. In the meantime, Ramsey, happy in the thought that he would now settle down on land which would soon be his, set to work making the kind of improvements that only the owner will make. Then, in 1817, Ramsey, quite elated and supplied with a nice sum of money, journeyed to St. Stephens in Alabama to attend the sale of government lands conducted by the Federal landoffice at that place. But on his arrival at St. Stephens, Ramsey was shocked and outraged to discover that a brother in the church, a man whom he regarded as a close friend and neighbor, was going to bid against him for the land he had selected and partially improved. Finally, he and the brother in the church agreed to divide the land without bidding against one another; but it was a wrong that Ramsey could not forget or forgive. Presently he sold his land, and apparently he sold it to a hard-bitten customer, who, as long as life lasted, would make life miserable for the brother in the church who had been so greedy.

With the money Ramsey had accumulated by the various processes just described, he purchased cattle, sheep, and swine; and these together with those he already

possessed, gave him, as his son expresses it, "a pretty good start of stock." With his large herds, Ramsey, now in ill health from palsy, moved out to the frontier about twenty miles from his old neighborhood and took up the less arduous life of a grazier. Here the family prospered despite the father's illness, and when the land on which he built his fine hewn log house came upon the market, he purchased it and thus acquired a substantial farmstead. Thus Ramsey rose from a poor young man with a large family to be a substantial grazier and landowning farmer. He had done this in less than twelve years, by thrift and heartbreaking toil of both himself and young family, and was severely handicapped by an increasing infirmity which his son describes as palsy, but which was probably also a spastic condition. He was apparently only in his middle thirties when this disease cut short his further climb up the economic ladder rendering him a complete, bed-ridden invalid. Most of Ramsey's neighbors were poor like himself, some, if not nearly all, having nothing more than a horse or two, a cow, a few swine, a two-wheeled wagon or cart, a crude plow, an axe, chisel, hammer, saw, rifle gun, so-called, a couple of feather beds, a few quilts, garden seeds, some corn, and cotton seeds, a few pewter dishes and steel knives and forks, a spinning wheel, a couple of frying pans and ovens, an iron pot and kettle, and a few earthenware vessels. The larger percent followed the exact pattern that Ramsey had followed, and with the help of their wives and children, boys and girls, patiently toiled upward to the status of freeholders, with herds of cattle and swine. Some were not as thrifty as Ramsey, or were more unlucky, and failed to obtain the ownership of land; others were possessed of more robust health, and were aided at the most opportune time by a large number of strapping sons, and even a slave or two. Such settlers not infrequently had on hand five or six hundred dollars in gold and silver. From those thus situated, though poor themselves, men of wealth would rise, even great planters. Such men had, more often than not, got their small start on another frontier further east. This was their second migration and probably their last, though, like Ramsey, they would probably move about in the same neighborhood before choosing their final place of settlement. Ramsey's brother in the church, who forced Ramsey to divide a tract of land with him, was apparently one of these who had acquired considerable cash and livestock at an earlier date on another frontier. He had also acquired the ruthlessness which, beneath their surface of neighborliness, most successful pioneers had.

Much depended upon when and where a person settled upon the public domain as to how far he could rise in the economic scale. An earlier settler had the pick of the land, and a late comer who wished to obtain such land would have to pay more and obtain less. Often, if not most of the time, the late comer, unless possessed of considerable cash, would move on until he found cheap land to his taste. But the early bird did not always pick the best worm; a settler took the best only of the particular type of land which he had been accustomed to cultivating in the old neighborhood from which he had come. Agricultural migrants always pick out land like that to which they are accustomed, so that they can continue the same kinds of crops and the same methods of cultivation. Those who in this way selected sandy loams soon impoverished their lands or saw them impoverished by erosion; while those who settled on clay loams and black prairie soils were more fortunate in that their lands neither wore out as quickly nor eroded as seriously. It was on the latter, more permanently rich soils, that both slaveholders and nonslaveholders frequently rose to the status of wealthy planters.

But the plain people made a much larger contribution to the leadership in other classes than to the planter class. It appears to be true in the lower South and in Tennessee and Kentucky that the bulk of lawyers, physicians, preachers, editors, teachers, business men, and political leaders below the national level were members of families who were poor or only comfortably well off. A young man of ability, energy, and determination--barring unusually bad luck--could scarcely fail of considerable success in any of the professions. He might never set the world on fire--in fact he probably would have no such desire as a rule--but he could nearly always rise to local leadership. After examining the life histories of a large number of individuals who have risen from obscurity and comparative poverty, one cannot fail to see that they all follow a similar pattern. First, the parents, though often very poor, usually possessed education beyond the limits of mere literacy and had great respect for education as a means of attaining success. Then, too, they had a certain refinement, which their robust neighbors did not usually have. Not that they were aloof or prideful in their bearing; only they nursed a spark in their bosoms which they were able to pass on to some of their children. Next, the son who felt this spark of pride and ambition, utilized all possible opportunities at home and at school to acquire education. After he had acquired sufficient education and age he would teach school, clerk in a store, or find other employment which would enable him to save enough money to attend the academy or even college. Apparently most young men of this type taught school. The third step was the preparation for his profession--usually the law, medicine, or the ministry.

If he were to be a lawyer, oftentimes he read law under the direction of an attorney, while teaching school, though occasionally he would attend a law school. When he had been admitted to the bar, he would usually enter a law office in a minor capacity—frequently as a sort of secretary and copyist for the firm. If he were shrewd and energetic—and usually young men of this type were—he would soon rise into a prominent position in the firm or as an independent attorney. The essentials to success were a practical knowledge of the law, an understanding of country jurors, some oratorical talent, and always cleverness in debate and repartee. There was much legal business in the rural South, and a lawyer of only modest talent could earn a good income. Such well-known men as Charles Tait, United States Senator and Federal Judge, William H. Crawford, United States Senator and Secretary of the Treasury, Joseph E. Brown, Governor, Judge, and United States Senator, Alexander H. Stephens, Congressman, Vice-President of the Confederacy and Governor, Henry Clay, and Patrick Henry followed the pattern sketched above. Indeed, says W. H. Sparks, from the ranks of the poor but ambitious youth arose most of those men so distinguished in Georgia's earlier history and that of her neighbors.

If the young man planned to become a physician, his preparation could be as little or as much as he desired and was able to pay for. The commonest procedure, even for the most ambitious, was to obtain employment with a practicing physician—such as keeping his books, driving his buggy, and running errands. In spare time, if any, the apprentice read the medical books in the doctor's office and perhaps dissected a cadaver—at least for a while until it spoiled completely. The doctor, no doubt, on his long drives would teach his assistant, as best he could, the knotty problems in his books and in his practice. After two or three years of this apprenticeship, the student doctor could, with no real difficulty, obtain license to practice; in fact, he could, without much risk, set up most anywhere and practice without license. Perhaps the majority of apprentice physicians did not end their studies at this point but went off for a course of lectures and study in a medical college, which would extend over a period varying from a few months to several years.

Often, however, a poor young man planning to be a physician, just as had the prospective lawyer, taught school or clerked in a store for the purpose of saving enough money to complete his academic education and pay his expenses in a medical school.

An examination of the life histories of large numbers of the clergy seems to indicate that an overwhelming majority were recruits from the ranks of the people and that they acquired their education in a fashion similar to that of the young men preparing for the other professions. Many began their careers as schoolmasters, and, indeed, many continued throughout life to teach school.

The life histories of those who entered business, such as banking, merchandising, and real estate (better known as land speculation), is not as well known as is that of those who entered one of the learned professions. What cases have been examined, however, indicate that—though the field was more limited in the South than those of planting and the professions—the percentage of those from the ranks of the common folk was high.

Since education was, for the poor but ambitious youth, the gateway to success in business and the professions, what were the opportunities for acquiring the necessary education? Much has been said, and even more has been assumed, and therefore implied, to the effect that the educational institutions of the South were practically closed to all but the well-to-do because of the great expense of attending them. It is certainly not my purpose to go into the history and theory of education in the Old South; but I will briefly point out a few facts which may indicate that the obstacles to acquiring an education were not very great—if an education was desired.

The first thing is to observe that the common folk of the South obviously received relatively more schooling than has generally been supposed to have been the case. By comparing the illiteracy of the Southern people with that of the people of New England, where, for well-known reasons, a common school system had long existed, the South has been made to appear as a land where mass ignorance prevailed. In 1850, for example, the census showed that only 1.89 percent of the white population of New England above twenty years of age could not read; but in the South 8.5 percent of this age group were illiterate. The fact was not advertised, however, that in the Northwest, where population was sparse and scattered somewhat as in the rural South over 5 percent of those above twenty were illiterate.

But just how illiterate is the 8.5 percent of the South? In comparison with the situation in most countries of the world at that time, the answer is that the Southern folk were one of the most literate major groups of the entire world. For example, in 1846, of all the couples throughout England and Wales who got married, 32.6 percent

of the men and 48.1 percent of the women affixed their marks instead of their signatures to applications for licenses. In the French army in 1851, of 311,218 conscripts, 34 percent could neither read nor write. The marriage and conscription records are very good cross sections of the young adult population; but in both France and England they were more literate than the older groups because of the improvement of the common school systems. In Spain, Portugal, Italy, the Balkans, Poland, and Russia illiteracy was between 70 and 95 percent. Only in the Scandinavian countries, and Belgium, Holland, Prussia, and Saxony, was the literacy of the people comparable with or greater than that of the South. Most of the children in the rural communities of the South, including those of the well-to-do, learned to read and write and cypher in the old field schools. These were elementary schools, in which reading and writing and arithmetic, and sometimes higher subjects, were taught. They were financed primarily by subscription, each child being charged about two and a half dollars for a five or six months term, and a dollar for a six weeks summer session. Toward the end of the period, many of these schools were receiving aid from both the state and county. Most of the academies, which will be discussed presently, had primary departments that taught the same things as the old field schools. The academies were usually located in a town or village.

Literacy, however, is not education; but if college attendance is any test of an educated people, the South had more educated men and women in proportion to population than the North or any other part of the world. In 1860, according to the census, out of a white population of 7,400,000, there were 25,882 students enrolled in Southern colleges, whereas in the North, with a white population of over 19,000,000, there were only 27,408 students in college; and quite a large number of these—over 1000—were from the South. That is, there was one college student for each 247 white persons in the South, and one in 703 in the North, part of whom were Southern.

It was, however, the academy more than the colleges that gave the poor but ambitious youths their education. There were, at the end of the ante-bellum period, about 2,500 academies. They nearly all had primary departments to take care of the youngsters of the town and vicinity; they all had what would have been called high school subjects, many of which are now taught in college; and all the larger, better equipped ones offered college work.

The tuition in these academies, most of which had ten months sessions, was low—about what the library, contingent, or athletic fee is in most of the schools today. For example, the tuition per annum in 1860 in the 57 academies of Georgia averaged \$15.50 for the elementary branches and, in the higher branches, \$26.00. A study of over a score of academies in Alabama shows that the tuition for a student ranged from \$15 to \$25 in the primary departments and \$25 to \$35 in the high schools. Those academies that gave college work usually charged \$40 to \$50 a year for such work. Board, room, and laundry ranged from eight to ten dollars per month. In short, for less than \$125 a young man or young lady could attend an academy for ten months.

Of course the quality of work offered by the academies varied with the quality of teachers and equipment. Knight, in his Public Education in the South, says that "the academy was a very highly respected means of education in the South, where it existed in greater numbers than in any other section of the country."

The following subjects were usually taught in the academies: Elementary: spelling, reading, writing and arithmetic, English grammar, geography; High School: chemistry, logic, ethics or moral philosophy, psychology (called intellectual science), physics, astronomy, political economy, composition and rhetoric, Greek, Latin, French, algebra, geometry, trigonometry, mechanical drawing, (and analytical geometry and calculus, by request). In the female Academies, drawing, painting, fine needle work, and music were always offered, the tuition being extra. All of these subjects were, of course, not required to graduate; indeed the student had a wide choice. Furthermore, he could take one subject at a time and work the remainder of his time, or he could take as many as he wished. The struggling country youth, who probably had saved enough money for one year, would take every course possible, and at the end of the year would probably go into a community and organize a subscription or old field school for the purpose of earning more money—or it might be that he would continue to teach in the old field school as a profession, and farm as a side line.

Thus, it may be asserted, the poor but ambitious youth of the Old South could eventually obtain adequate education to enter one of the professions. Once he had become a member of such a profession, statistical studies seem to indicate that a very large number were successful, some on a local level, some on a state level, and many on a national level.

I will conclude with a few generalizations. The first is that the idea of a fixed stratification of the population of the Old South is totally erroneous. Society in the South—as it was in the North and everywhere and at all times—was stratified. The stratification was not, however, that of three groups, slaveholding planter, slave, and nonslaveholding poor white. On the contrary, Southern society was composed of a complex series of economic and social groups, each shading off into the other imperceptibly. But of paramount importance, it was not a rigid and fixed stratification; for it was not difficult to move from one group to the other. The poor but ambitious could rise to the highest category in the planter and professional classes, and even in business; and the wealthy could descend to the very bottom—and sometimes with such rapidity and momentum that they knocked the bottom out. This fluid stratification and the ensuing ability to move from one social group to another is today called social mobility, a very descriptive term introduced by the anthropologists, perhaps. The social mobility of the Old South was based fundamentally upon the presence of vast quantities of cheap public lands always available to the settlers during the antebellum period. Even the rise to prominence in the professions and in business depended indirectly upon the presence of this cheap and plentiful land; for, had there been a scarcity of land, as in Western Europe, the younger sons of the wealthy would have monopolized these fields. The degree of social mobility in any society is the most important index to the health of such a society. Social mobility is the fundamental requirement and an essential characteristic of democracy. Without it, democracy withers on the vine, and stratification becomes rigid and fixed, and such a society may expect an explosion. Judged by this standard, then, the Old South at the outbreak of the Civil War was still in a reasonable state of health.

THE COUNTRY STORE OF THE OLD SOUTH—A NEW APPRAISAL

The Southern Country Store, 1800-1860. By Lewis P. Atherton. (Baton Rouge: 1949. \$ 3.50)

Southern country stores, like the southern yeoman for whom they lived, and moved, and had their being, have until recently been overlooked by history... Unfortunately, the country store was taken for granted in its own day, and no one seems to have bothered too much about its ancestry or its public morals—a fate which it shared with the common man...

Atherton's treatment of the country store in the ante-bellum period is exhaustive. Approaching his subject laterally with an introductory survey of southern marketing procedures, he proceeds to a devastating analysis of the factorage system. It was once fashionable among historians to speak of the economy of the Old South exclusively in terms of staple crops and cotton factors, simply because these features of southern agricultural capitalism were engendered by the plantation economy. Going to the trouble to cite the statistics, Atherton has proved, to the utter embarrassment of the moonlight-and-magnolia school, that only the crème de la crème of the Old South could have cut their economic lives to the plantation pattern, while the average man and even many planters of moderate means rarely saw a factor in the flesh, much less established a speaking acquaintance with him. In short, except in those instances where a factor maintained business ties with country storekeepers, the average Southerner doubtless lived his life as mercifully unaware of the mysteries of factorage as he was of most of the aspects of an economic system which existed of, by, and for the well-to-do. Every year much of the small farmer's corn, cotton, and tobacco eventually found its way through the medium of the storekeeper into the hands of the factor. This transmigration was doubtless far removed from the ken of the small operator, who had about as much concern for what happened to his economic progeny as a feline mother for its weaned offspring. At any rate, Atherton has definitely proved that, at least in so far as the number of patrons was concerned, the southern factorage system has been vastly overrated...

In his final chapter Atherton gets down to what seems to be the major contribution of his study; namely, the position the storekeeper occupied in southern society. After examining every shred of material available, Atherton concludes that except for the major lamentations of Hinton R. Helper and D. R. Hundley, and the minor whimperings of a few cracker-barrel philosophers, there is practically no evidence that the southern storekeeper was a hideous monster who oppressed the rustics or that his turning a hand to trade degraded him socially. Pointing out that the ambitious sons of the wellborn were no less interested in merchandising than were the ambitious sons of the bumpkins, Atherton convincingly dispels the ancient myth about the lowly position of the tradesman in the Old South. While successful professional men, including storekeepers, usually were inclined to end their days as leisured planters, Atherton suggests that after all trade was a young man's occupation, that one went into trade, built a fortune, and retired to the plantation not in an effort to get away from an ignominious occupation but in order to pursue a way of life best adapted to the maturer years, where leisure and pleasurable living are greatly desired. The merchant who became a planter was not necessarily climbing the social ladder; he was doubtless merely progressing through the seven ages of man.

How then did the myth of mercantile degradation in the Old South ever gain credence? Perhaps this legend stems from the apocrypha of the latter-day unreconstructed rebel, who is often misled by his day-dreams of a glofy that never was. Actually the Old South was no more of a static society than it was a static economy. The bottom rail was forever coming to the top, and few there were who were content to leave their feet on the bottom rung of the social ladder. Whether, in that age of "enlightened self-interest," a man begged, borrowed, stole, or merchandised his way into the ranks of the élite was apparently of considerably less importance to the so-called Old South than it was to its inheritors. Atherton's merchant of the Old South, whose social status was just as good as his bank account, was a self-made man in a self-made society. In fact, the more one learns of the Old South, the greater the conviction becomes that wherever it was it was not old. It was really new, and it partook of a society that was a-borning rather than a-dying. The moldy aroma of the heirloom today is something that time rather than the times produced. — John K. Bettersworth in Journal of Southern History.

The T.V.A. and the Land-Grant College

by

L. A. OLSON

Contact Officer, T.V.A.-Miss. State College

The Tennessee Valley Authority, a corporate structure, was created by an Act of Congress and signed by President Roosevelt on May 18, 1933. This Act represents the culmination of a long period of historical development for the control and utilization of the Tennessee River, beginning in 1824 during the administration of President James Monroe in the form of a recommendation from John C. Calhoun who was then Secretary of War.

Wilson Dam, authorized by Congress in 1916 and completed by U. S. Army Engineers in 1925, was the result of a conviction of Congress that it was possible to seize the power inherent in falling water in that portion of the Tennessee River and to direct its forces against enemies in time of war and toward the preservation of the Nation's soils and the sustenance of its people in the longer sessions of peace. The Act directed the Board, among other things, to use these government-owned properties as a factory laboratory for the production of improved fertilizers and to distribute such materials through the agency of agricultural colleges, or otherwise at the discretion of the Board, for testing both scientifically and under practical farm conditions, so as to obtain information as to the value, effect, best methods of use, and economic returns which they produce.

More specifically, the Board was authorized to use these properties to produce such elements of plant food as will protect land and water resources, restore and conserve fertility and, as a result of the abundance of these elements in the soil, reduce the cost of crop production to the land, to the farmer, and to the national economy which rests on the soil.

Further, the Board was obligated to produce that kind of fertilizer which the farmer most needs and which is most difficult to get; to produce it at a lower cost, not per bag at the factory, but per unit of plant food delivered to the farm.

These mandates presented a new challenge to determine the worth of such plant food products not only in customary terms but in their continued effect upon the land, upon market levels, and upon the sustained well-being of people over a long period of years.

These obligations of the Authority found their counterpart in the objectives of the state land-grant colleges. The use of experimental fertilizers manufactured by the Authority, the need to protect soil and water resources, and the improvement of the general welfare of people on a regional basis provide the approach to the agricultural institutions. For the Authority to proceed independently, therefore, in the attainment of its objectives would involve duplication of organization, equipment, and personnel and a waste of public funds, coupled with probable confusion on the part of farmers and minimizing of practical results. On the other hand, the colleges recognized that in cooperating with the Authority in the discharge of its responsibilities, an opportunity was provided to them for enlarging their facilities and means of practical work with farmers in order to carry out more efficiently their own fixed objectives. The things in which the Authority was interested were not something new and foreign to the college programs. They were a natural and integrated part of these programs. Authority-produced fertilizers and financial assistance therefore became a means of implementing in a large and vital way the long-time programs of the colleges.

Thus in the very beginning, the Authority elected to fulfill its responsibilities to the Congress through the land-grant college institutions which had proved themselves so successful in discharging their obligations to both the people and Congress over a period of 70 odd years. Heretofore such allocations to the institutions by the Federal Government had been determined by congressional mandate and surrounded by regulations which permitted the exercise of little or no discretion in their use. Here was the first example of a federally-controlled agency volunteering to place at the disposal of state institutions for their own freedom of control, direction, and use, the necessary facilities for the attainment of their more basic objectives.

In late 1933, a meeting of representatives of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Tennessee Valley Authority, and presidents of the land-grant colleges of the seven states lying in part within the Tennessee River Basin, was held in Washington. This meeting had for its purpose a free and frank discussion of Authority objectives in the field of agricultural development and watershed protection and how they might best be integrated with departmental and institutional programs. Out of this meeting grew a Memorandum of Agreement to which the three parties became signatories. This Memorandum set forth, in general terms, policies and methods under which the joint activities would be carried on. It also provided for a Correlating Committee consisting of one representative from each of the three groups with a full-time Executive Secretary. The duty of this Committee is to give over-all guidance to the joint programs.

Following this Memorandum, and in February 1934, the Valley state land-grant colleges signed contracts with the Authority and assumed full responsibility for carrying on the joint programs within the respective states. These contracts, which dealt largely with research work, were superseded by what was termed Master Contracts on July 1, 1935, and provided for all activities in the field of research and extension to be undertaken by the cooperating agencies within the states.

The colleges, under the terms of this contract, were authorized to select and direct all additional personnel needed to properly discharge its provisions, for which expenses they were reimbursed on a monthly basis by the Authority. This arrangement identifies such personnel as direct employees of the institutions and subject to institutional regulations. It represented a new and unique departure in the field of federal-state relationships.

Agreements were prepared subsequently under this contract, spelling out in detail how and to what extent each activity would be carried on and the specific objectives to be attained. Supplemental project agreements have been prepared during the past seventeen years dealing with enlarged or additional activities such as rural electrification education, farm machinery development, irrigation and numerous others.

Freedom of action here is determined only by results. Over a period of seventeen years, it has developed into a highly satisfactory arrangement both to cooperating institutions and the Authority. It has enabled the institutions to very greatly multiply their effectiveness in all their relationships with farm people. It has provided the Authority with accurate, factual information necessary to fulfill its obligations to the Congress. It has created a greater incentive on the part of farm people to make larger contributions through their own leadership toward shaping their own destinies.

THE COLUMBIA "ASSEMBLY" PLAN

General Dwight D. Eisenhower has disclosed plans for a long-term Columbia University project to be known as "The American Assembly." The assembly is the result of an idea he had had long before he accepted the presidency of Columbia in 1948. It will take the form of a program of continuing conferences to bring together representatives of business, labor, the professions, political parties and government. Its purpose is to throw impartial light on the major problems that confront the nation. This can best be accomplished, according to General Eisenhower's plan, by calling in members of the university's scholastic staff to provide the historical and philosophic background of current problems that will be discussed at assembly sessions. Then, men with practical experience in fields under consideration will proceed with the discussion in an attempt to arrive at a workable solution, if one actually can be attained.

"It seems to me," the General said, "that this should result in an invaluable combination of theory with experience, a combination, for conference purposes at least, which as far as I know is available nowhere else on a large scale...The university today has a most tremendous chance to be useful, not only in advancing the frontiers of knowledge but in taking actual current problems and working out practical solutions. The American Assembly will provide this new type of service to the public in a field in which such a service now is vitally needed."

The assembly will be administered by the Columbia Graduate School of Business. The first American assembly conference will start on April 1, 1951, with fifty faculty members and invited participants present. The topic has not been selected. The plan is to hold eight conferences a year, each lasting three to five days.

The Battle of the "Bookfarmers"

GENERAL LEE AND THE DEFENSE OF THE MISSISSIPPI A. & M. COLLEGE, 1882-1900

by

JOHN K. BETTERS-WORTH

The twenty years of General Lee at the college were never more turbulent than during the period of unrest in the late eighties and early nineties when the Farmers' Alliance and its political handmaiden, the Populist Party, were on the move in Mississippi. Agrarian unrest found its motivation in the same hard grievances that had sent the Patrons of Husbandry to the economic barricades in the seventies. After a brief period of uncertain prosperity in the early eighties, farm conditions began to worsen rapidly. Farm prices were dropping to new lows, farm lands were dropping into the hands of the merchant-creditor class, and "Big Business" appeared to have seized control of the government. These were ideal conditions for the appearance of movements demanding radical reform; and for a moment even the inherently conservative American farmer found himself at the point of revolt.

In Mississippi, with the Grange on the wane in the eighties, the time was ripe for the appearance of the Alliance and Populism. The recognized leader of the embattled farmers at that time was Frank Burkitt, who, partly from personal spite, partly from personal conviction, attempted both as an Alliance man and as a legislator, to direct all the wrath of the man in the furrow against what he called that "expensive" institution of "bookfarmers" at Starkville, the "tombstone industry," Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College. That the college survived Burkitt's onslaught is a testimony both to the resistance of the Mississippi farmer to radical agitation and to the generalship of Stephen D. Lee, who was himself a wavering member of the Alliance.

The Burkitt feud with the college had its origins in personalities and politics. Blewitt Lee recalls that the break between his father and Burkitt seems to have occurred when Lee dropped Burkitt's Chickasaw Messenger from the list of newspapers for which the college subscribed. It may have been that trouble arose over such a petty thing as that; but one would rather suspect that since Burkitt's name disappeared from the list of college trustees immediately upon the inauguration of Robert Lowrey as governor in 1882, political differences may have been involved. At any rate, when he was elected to the House of Representatives in 1886, Burkitt became one of the bitterest critics of the Lowrey administration. That the college also should become the victim of Burkitt's spleen is not surprising, in view of the disposition of Burkitt to see no good whatsoever in any governmental institution with which Lowrey was associated. Needless to say, at the time, many people felt that the Burkitt attack on the college could be attributed to a sore toe. But, whatever the motive, it must be recognized that Burkitt was the bête noir of the college in the eighties and nineties, that he was the abettor of all attacks, however absurd, made on the A. and M. College.

Attacks on the A. and M. College were to be expected. The very fact that it was an experiment attempted in the wake of the failure of industrial education at the University, placed the school in the embarrassing position of having every word and act subjected to public scrutiny. The fact that Lee and his faculty traveled far and wide over the state publicizing the work of the college attests to a realization on the part of the administration that the college must fight for survival.

When Lee invited the Press Association to the campus in the spring of 1881, he made no attempt to conceal the fact that he regarded the newspapermen, "who have the destinies of the State more completely in your hands than any other," as "messengers from (the people) to see this College;" and Lee pled for their "sympathy and aid in making this Institution realize what the people of the State expect." Actually, the press was exceedingly cordial, for the most part; and, with few exceptions, journalistic opinion seems always to have been predominantly favorable, even in the leanest years. In particular, the agricultural press, led by the Southern Livestock Journal, gave the college favorable publicity in the critical years.

The first account-taking of the college experiment occurred in 1882, when a legislative investigating committee visited the campus on February 10 to "examine into the present condition of that Institution, including its general management, discipline, adaptation to the end for which created, and present usefulness and prospects for future good."² The investigation committee was composed of twelve lawyers, one merchant, and one farmer, much to the perturbation of the agriculturalists, who feared a "bloody report." The Southern Livestock Journal, however, appealed to the

1. Jackson Weekly Clarion, June 9, 1881.

2. Mississippi, House Journal, 1882, 233.

"lawyers" for mercy:

Admit what is impossible; admit that this committee came with hostile intent; admit that death to this young Institution was premeditated, and that twelve lawyers were selected on account of some supposed fitness as executioners of the murderous design. Do you not suppose that when brought face to face with their helpless victims, with no alumni of her own yet in Legislative halls to plead in behalf of their Alma Mater, when brought face to face with over two hundred Mississippi boys, as witnesses of the bloody scene, do you then not believe that the very helplessness of the victims, the silent, eloquent appeal of these Mississippi boys representing as they do a class, numerically the greatest and the largest tax-paying in the State, do you not believe that then a rising sense of justice and magnanimity to this large, but uneducated class that had so cheerfully and so long sustained their own Law School at Oxford in the past would stay the falling of the uplifted ax, and prevent the commission of a great crime against the industrial classes and the industrial interests of the State of Mississippi.

Do you suppose that any man of aspirations for future position, and place would antagonize the rising hopes of the young men of this State and make this farmer's school a mere play-thing, a political football for his own use, and thus trifle with interests & with rights so dear and so sacred to the hearts of so many? Believe it, who may, we do not - lawyers in the past have been its friends, its able champions, its guardian, and its protectors, and these twelve men will constitute no exception to the rule, and will bring no blush of shame to the cheek of the profession.³

Although we do not know the contents of the report that resulted from this investigation, there was apparently nothing in it derogatory to the interests of the college. Never quite willing to rest secure, however, the college authorities were ever on the alert to win the friendship of the people. In September, 1833, for example, the faculty enjoined a special committee to draft a plan for "working up the good opinion of the public towards the College."⁴

Actually, the first specific grievance to plague the college--in fact, it became a perpetual complaint--was the fact that the enrollment from nearby areas was out of proportion to that from the remainder of the state, as a result of which some deserving applicants had been turned away. In order to eliminate this criticism, the legislature of 1882 set up an apportionment rule by which each county would be given students in proportion to its number of educable white children. The county superintendent and the chancery clerks were to determine on the basis of examinations the ones to be admitted from their counties. After September 1 of each year, the unfilled places would be declared vacant and filled by the president with preference being given to counties having the largest number of educable children.⁵

The apportionment scheme did not work. Many applicants, becoming discouraged by the necessity of waiting a great length of time before knowing their status, went elsewhere. Also, as Lee complained, the difficulty of gaining admission was being used "by canvassers for other colleges against this institution."⁶ Nevertheless, the law remained on the books; and there was much captious criticism of the college for supposed violations of the apportionment provisions.

Most of the criticism arose over the fact that the number of day students from Oktibbeha County was large. There was no restriction on day students, however; for the necessity of county allotments had arisen only because of the lack of dormitory space.⁷ Frank Burkitt, of course, found that in spite of the quota scheme, the enrollment came largely from the wealthier counties. In fact, he quoted statistics for the years 1882-5 to show that over half the students were from the supposedly wealthy counties of Adams, Clay, Lowndes, Hinds, Holmes, Jefferson, Monroe, Madison, Noxubee, and Oktibbeha. "We presume," wrote Burkitt, "it will not be insisted by anybody that the sons of poor men in these ten rich counties flocked to the College and took possession of more than half the rooms in the Dormitory. And if the A. & M. students are not the sons of the poor men in the rich counties, nor the sons of the poor men in the poor counties as all the reports conclusively show, we would ask, who are the beneficiaries of the extravagant appropriations made to the 'Tombstone Industry'?" Actually, the counties described by Burkitt as rich were not by any means the only wealthy counties in the state, and there would be strong doubts as to whether Oktibbeha might be listed as wealthy. However, for the purpose of getting statistics, Oktibbeha county with its preponderant day-student contribution would provide excellent padding for Burkitt's figures. In fact, he accused that county of having converted the college into a "local academy," and at one time the executive committee of the board in desperation actually placed a ban on the further acceptance of preparatory students from Oktibbeha county.⁸

Much discussion also arose over the propriety of allowing out-of-state students

3. Southern Livestock Journal, February 9, 1882.

4. Minutes of the Faculty, September 24, 1883.

5. Mississippi, Laws, 1882, 74-76.

6. Biennial Report, 1883, 11-12.

7. Biennial Report, 1886-1887, 6-7.

8. Jackson Weekly Clarion, February 17, 1886; Chickasaw Messenger, clipping (1887); Minutes of the Board, September 19, 1889.

to enroll. Although some few were taken, the board was loath to accept them for fear of criticism. Between 1881 and 1884, 52 non-state students were admitted, 27 of whom were Alabamians.⁹ Eventually provision was made for the admission of not over forty such students at \$20 a year tuition fee, with the understanding that they were not to be allowed in the dormitory unless there were vacancies resulting from the lack of state enrollment.¹⁰ Only a handful of non-state students appear to have attended under these relaxed arrangements. In 1887, for example, there were only four.¹¹ Meanwhile, Lee complained bitterly over the fact that in "the other State College, even students from adjoining States got their tuition free."¹²

The county apportionment thorn remained in the college side for years to come. In 1888 the legislature, in a bill introduced by Burkitt, revised the quota, setting a maximum of 300 students to be allotted among the counties, and providing that tuition be charged for any in excess of the quotas. The apportionments were to be made by the county supervisors, and the places need not be given to the best qualified students, particularly if it were found that their parents were financially able to pay for the schooling of their sons. In fact, any provision calling for the awarding of the scholarships according to grades on examination papers was excluded, said Burkitt, lest the better-schooled boys from the towns "gobble-up" the places.¹³

By a technicality the attorney general ruled the new law inapplicable for the session of 1888-1889, on the ground that it was supposed to go into effect on October 1, 1888, while the college had recently set its opening earlier than that date.¹⁴ However, Lee and the board decided to abide by the spirit of the law, lest it "intensify our enemies." Lee would, however, "use our experience" regarding the anticipated discrepancy between applicants and those who really came.¹⁵ In 1890 the apportionment law was repealed, but in 1892 the system was revised to pacify the soreheads, the quota henceforth being set by the president of the college and applied by the county superintendents.¹⁶ "This law," complained Lee, "is based on the idea that some counties have been more favored than others by the College, and that county superintendents of education will look after the interests of their respective counties and see that they are represented. It virtually places the attendance...in their hands, and takes it out of the hands of the President and College authorities. It is yet to be seen if it is a wise law."¹⁷ By 1896, Lee was demanding the repeal of the apportionment law on the ground that it curtailed enrollment by making it appear that "there is no room for other students." Moreover, Lee was irritated that students had to be "examined for this College and not for other State institutions."¹⁸ At this time the system was liberalized slightly by allowing quotas of new students to be made irrespective of the number from each county already enrolled.¹⁹ Henceforth, the issue seems to have died a natural death. At the turn of the century the college entered upon an expansion program which made room for all who desired to enter.

A point of considerable anxiety to General Lee from the day the college first opened its doors was the degree to which it was serving the industrial classes for which it was created, particularly the farmers. Certainly, the farmer class was far in the majority among the students. In the second, third, and fourth sessions, the boys from farm parents were 178 of the total students enrolled, while only 136 came from other professions, which included 27 merchants, 20 physicians, 14 lawyers, 14 officeholders, 9 clerks, 6 mechanics, and 6 bookkeepers, with a sprinkling of millers, tailors, carpenters, cabinet makers, editors, masons, steamboatmen, livery-stable keepers, veterinarians, butchers, hotelkeepers, civil engineers, lumbermen, cotton brokers, school-teachers, insurance men, shoemakers, ship's carpenters, contractors, raftsmen, blacksmiths, drummers and salesmen, bankers, jewelers, brickyard owners, ministers, railroad-men, telegraph operators, teamsters, gunsmiths, and liquor dealers. Nearly all of these were from the so-called "industrial classes." In fact, in 1883 Lee estimated that 85% of the current year's enrollment came from that group.²⁰

In 1889, Lee asserted that 80% of all students attending for the last several sessions had been "sons of men engaged in farming."²¹ Surprisingly enough, in the years 1881-1884 there were 206 students who indicated farming as their choice of occupation as opposed to only 178 students coming from farm parents! In 1885-6, the farmers-to-be were 88, to 60 farm parents. Of course, the college being an agricultural institution, the farm trainees would be expected to be numerous; but it is interesting to note that a number of these who chose agriculture were not sons of farmers. Yet, in spite of this condition, which must have momentarily gladdened Lee's heart, there was an alarming number of professional casualties both during the period of college training and afterwards. Notwithstanding the fact that Lee reported in 1883 that the college was instructing in agriculture more students than any other institution in the United States, with the exception of Michigan and Kansas, the number of farmers produced by the college was disappointingly small.²²

9. Registrar's Records
10. Minutes of the Board, November 14, 1883; November 30, 1885
11. Lee to L. H. Babb, October 12, 1887, President's Letter Book
12. Biennial Report, 1888-1889, 11.
13. Chickasaw Messenger, April 12, 1888.

14. Chickasaw Messenger, May 31, 1888; June 7, 1888.
15. Lee to H.M. Street, March 20, 1888, President's Letter Book.
16. Mississippi, Code, 1892, 22-25.
17. Biennial Report, 1892-1893, 8.
18. Biennial Report, 1894-1895, 10.
19. Mississippi, Laws, 1906, 117.
20. Biennial Report, 1882-1883, 12.
21. Ibid., 1888-1889, 15.
22. Biennial Report, 1880-1, 13.

The earliest graduates generally went into law or medicine, and Dr. W. A. Evans recalled Lee's frantic search for students who would become agriculturists upon graduation. In 1886 Lee was able to report that of 27 living graduates, 14 were "in farming, dairying or engaged in strictly agricultural pursuits."²³ Lee felt that this was a record, for Michigan A. and M. could then boast slightly over 50%, while Massachusetts could report only 30%. Frank Burkitt, however, chose to represent these fourteen "theoretical" farmers, as he called them, as being the sole output of the college. "Fourteen scientific farmers on an outlay of \$304,000, or an average of one for a little more than \$21,000! We challenge Gen. Lee," said Burkitt, "to name five graduates of his college at the expiration of the fifth year of his arduous labors in educating farmers, who actually engaged in practical agriculture."²⁴

Burkitt's impertinence caused Lee much embarrassment, and we find the college in the late eighties busily setting about the compilation of figures to show the true picture of its accomplishments. In April, 1887, circular letters were sent out to former students asking the following questions:

- 1st. How much time did you spend at the A. and M. College?
- 2nd. What is your present occupation?
- 3rd. What occupation do you intend to follow?
- 4th. Do you consider the time spent at the College of special value to you in fitting you for any business you may follow?
- 5th. If you are farming or expect to farm, did your course at the college influence you in this decision?
- 6th. Do you consider the work of the College, educational and otherwise, of advantage to the farmers of the State?

Finally, from statistics covering the first ten sessions, J. C. Herbert compiled a table showing that of 86 male graduates then living, 32 were engaged in farming or kindred pursuits, while 14 were teachers, 11 were lawyers, 6 were bookkeepers, 4 were merchants, 4 were engineers, 4 were physicians, 7 were medical students, 2 were clerks, one was a minister, and one was unaccounted for. This represented slightly more than one-third of the graduates in agricultural work, — a percentage, which, though disappointing, was far better than the national average. At the same time, the college made a study of students who had left the college before graduation. Here the figures were more encouraging. It was found that of one-year students, 42% had returned to the farm, of two-year students, 43% had done so, while of the three-year students 31% were in farming.²⁵

As time passed, the college emphasized more and more the fact that whether graduates or not, those who spent time at the college were much the better for their exposure to an agricultural atmosphere. Lee was exceedingly proud of the fact that graduates of A. and M. were in demand at other agricultural colleges. In 1893 a correspondent of the Clarion told of three graduates who had excelled in experiment station work and agricultural teaching in North Carolina.²⁷

Of course, as the college grew, particularly after the addition of the mechanical department, the "practical" graduates were spread more thinly than ever. In 1897 a committee set to work compiling statistics again on the occupations of graduates; but there is no evidence that the findings were ever made public. Nevertheless, in the first issue of the Reveille, which appeared in 1893, 173 living graduates were listed, of which 47 were in farming or related fields, 14 in engineering work, 7 in merchandising, and 17 in teaching. Law and medicine had made the largest inroads on the graduates, law claiming 17 and medicine 27.²⁸ It was these lawyers and physicians who caused the greatest embarrassment to Lee, whose own son graduated at A. and M. to go to Harvard as a law student! Perhaps, however, Lee's concern was really unjustified; for there was no good reason why lawyers and doctors should not have a good foundation in the sort of training offered at the college. Nevertheless, Lee was genuinely disturbed over the situation, and in 1897 a faculty committee was charged with suggesting a plan "whereby the Industrial departments at the College may be made more attractive to students."²⁹

In a period when Mississippians had to dig deep in their pockets to contribute even the smallest sums to the public purse, the questions as to whether they were getting their money's worth out of the A. and M. College was more than academic. When Frank Burkitt entered the legislature in 1886 as an avowed enemy of Governor Lowrey and all his works, he got himself appointed to the House Appropriations committee. Here Burkitt was in a position to attack every item of public expenditure, soon earning for himself the name of "watchdog of the treasury." About the college, he was rather regarded somewhat as a dog in the manger.

The invective Burkitt unleashed against A. and M. College involved the expenditure of many bitter words in the House and an endless flow of editorial denunciation in the Messenger. Burkitt even dressed for the role, decking himself in the two holiest articles of apparel he could have found: a Confederate gray uniform topped off with a wool hat.³⁰

23. Jackson Weekly Clarion, February 24, 1886.

24. Jackson Weekly Clarion, February 17, 1886;

Chickasaw Messenger, February 10, 1887.

25. Chickasaw Messenger, December 15, 1887.

26. Biennial Report, 1888-1889, 20-21.

27. Weekly Clarion, June 29, 1893.

28. Reveille, 1893, 33-44.

29. Minutes of the Faculty, February 1, 1897.

30. Mrs. H. S. Broadway, Frank Burkitt: The Man in the Wool Hat, M.S. Thesis (Mississippi State College, 1948), 18-19.

During his first months in the legislature Burkitt affiliated himself with a group of 70 members who pledged not to increase public taxes, a move which was chiefly responsible for reducing the college appropriations for 1886-87. Although the college fought back, it was at a disadvantage from the start, for Governor Lowrey, himself, anticipating the Burkitt attack, had recommended a reduction in college support much greater than that actually made.³¹ In fact, Lee was exceedingly irritated with Lowrey, particularly because of the fact that the Governor's message had specifically "dissented" from the president's financial recommendations. "To be thus singled out alone, and minutely & critically dissected, and the other colleges generally approved & commended I did not expect." Writing to T. B. Carroll, the Oktibbeha representative, Lee begged him to exert every effort to turn the tide of persecution from the college. "You will find more in it to strike the popular cord, than anything to be presented during this Legislature," wrote Lee.³² In the end the college appropriation was reduced by \$10,286 for the 1886-1887 biennium.³³

Eventually, not satisfied with injury, Burkitt turned to insult; and in February, 1886, a series of articles from his pen began to appear in the press under the title, "Our State Finances and Our School System." In these writings Burkitt developed his famous "Wool Hat" philosophy, which subsequently appeared in pamphlet form as The Wool Hat. Burkitt began his assault with the accusation that the state colleges were monopolized by "the favored 'circle'," while the poor dirt farmers were too poor to pay the rail fare and the board bills involved in college attendance.

To make matters worse, the funds that should have gone to common schools were being diverted to maintain such institutions as the A. and M. College. Burkitt then proceeded to show how the per capita allowance to the state-supported colleges was \$175.05 in 1882 and \$108.54 in 1883 as compared to a per capita allotment of only 79¢ for the common schools. "We expend \$250,000 (in round numbers) on less than 1000 of the favored sons and daughters of Mississippi, in the space of two years and during the same period we dole out to the 250,000 boys and girls in the common schools \$370,000 or about \$1.50 each." Burkitt found that the per capita appropriation for the A. and M. College for 1884-1885 was \$161.87. Pointing out by way of contrast the small cost of sending a boy or girl to one of the state's private colleges, Burkitt asserted that "the State Colleges should be required to compete on equal terms with private educational institutions of equal capacity.... I assert as a fact that the State can issue scholarships to all its college students, pay their transportation to Yale and Harvard, and the regular tuition charged at those far-famed institutions of learning, and save money." Actually, if the state wished to continue to operate its colleges, it should, said Burkitt, give each school \$50 annually for each student and not a cent more.³⁴ In fact, Burkitt was soon advocating that the state "lease out the colleges."³⁵ Burkitt also attacked the costliness of the A. and M. College staff, whom he described as living free of charge in "elegant residences" at salaries as high as \$2000 per annum, while spending only three hours a day working! Then, when appropriations were reduced, said Burkitt, the cut came not in salaries but in the pay for student labor.³⁶

Burkitt found all manner of pleasure in revealing the fact that the college farm was none too prosperous. He despised Gulley, the "Michigan professor, who runs the college farms," and asserted that if the people followed Gulley's example, "it is only a question of time when they will all starve."³⁷ In 1884-85 the farm showed an excess of expenditures over receipts of \$5,742.69.³⁸ What Burkitt did not admit was that the deficit was the result of stock losses coupled with the fact that student labor costs were deducted from the farm accounts.³⁹ Presently, the ever-fertile Burkitt brain came forward with the suggestion that the college be closed and Gulley's farm be turned over to the penitentiary for use as a model farm!⁴⁰

The chemistry department also ran afoul of Burkitt. In 1887 there was a veritable tempest in a test tube over the fact that the state chemist had requested the payment of \$5.00 from a citizen who wished to have a stone analyzed.⁴¹ Henceforth chemistry Professor Myers, who had also lobbied against the 1886 appropriation bill, was anathema to Burkitt:

Prof. Myers, who is a nice, clever gentleman, but an imported scholar, is at the head of this department, occupies a nice residence belonging to the State, and draws with wonderful regularity his \$2,000 salary. A great portion of his time is devoted to travelling around over the State, lecturing in the interest of big appropriations, while Prof. Harrington, a Chickasaw boy, presides over the department of chemistry, at a salary, we believe of \$800 a year. We are reliably informed that Prof. Harrington is equally as efficient as Prof. Myers, and that he is perfectly competent to manage the chair of chemistry alone and unaided. Then we ask, why not increase his salary to \$1,200 a year and let

31. Mississippi, House Journal, 1886, 30-31.

32. Lee to T. B. Carroll, January 12, 1886,

President's Letter Book

33. Biennial Report, 1886-1887, 5.

34. Jackson Weekly Clarion, February 17, 1886.

35. Chickasaw Messenger, January 13, 1887.

36. Chickasaw Messenger, January 6, 1887.

37. Jackson Weekly Clarion, February 17, 1886.

38. Chickasaw Messenger, February 24, 1887.

39. Biennial Report, 1884-1885, 33-34.

40. Chickasaw Messenger, March 24, 1887.

41. Chickasaw Messenger, March 3, 17, 1887.

Prof. Myers canvass some other State, or Territory, Kingdom, or Principality in the interest of theoretical agriculture and thus save the taxpayers of Mississippi \$1600 a year and at the same time promote a worthy son of Mississippi? If this were done, perhaps a citizen of the State might send a keg of mineral water to the College and have it analyzed without being charged a fee, and we would have the consolation of knowing that home talent and worth was properly appreciated. We vote for this change and recommend its adoption in all the other departments at the A. & M. similarly situated.⁴²

Burkitt's assault on department heads continued in the legislature of 1888 with a statement made on the floor of the House to the effect that they "performed very little labor; leaving the work of instruction to their subordinates." This was more than hard-working Dr. Magruder, of the English department, could bear. He forthwith wrote a letter of protest to Burkitt, enclosing three letters from the "subordinates" attesting to the fact that the head of the department had never shirked his duty.⁴³ Meanwhile, the Board had ordered an investigation; and in March, 1888, the charges were pronounced as "without foundation in fact."⁴⁴

A considerable amount of Burkitt's vilification of department heads and lesser lights at the college was obviously based upon the fact that certain prominent members of the staff were not Mississippians. In 1887 Burkitt had raised the issue and had received some support from the state press.⁴⁵ When an epidemic of resignations followed upon the salary cuts of 1888, and there was much resentment over the fact that the departure of faculty members for other parts was a loss to the state, Burkitt announced that it was his belief that "positions of trust, profit, and honor in Mississippi should be awarded to Mississippians, anyway, to begin with, rather than "send abroad for an 'imported' scholar."⁴⁶

The Burkitt menace to college appropriations became extremely serious in the 1888 session of the legislature, when he became chairman of the appropriations committee. First of all, he brought the college to task for not submitting itemized accounts of its financial activities. Secretary Watson promptly complied for A. and M. College and was interviewed by Burkitt, who forthwith came out with a violent denunciation of the "extravagance" of the institution, where "even the pay of the negro teamsters and day laborers" was \$15 a month as compared to a reported pay of \$10 a month "on adjoining plantations."⁴⁷ Although he seems to have resisted an economy move directed against the interest rate in the Chickasaw school fund, from which his own county benefitted, Burkitt managed to deal the college the most serious financial blow to date by getting the appropriation reduced for the next biennium by \$14,880. Also, in order to force reductions in salaries, which the board had maintained almost intact for the two previous years by the device of shifting funds, the appropriation bill specifically listed the salaries to be paid "from the President to the lowest officer," with the result that A. and M. employees received about one-fourth less than was paid to "similar members of the Faculty of other first-class institutions in and out of the State." What was hardest for Lee to bear was the fact that the college was alone subjected to this "heroic treatment" involving "an experiment in College management."⁴⁸

Although the board resolved to "stand by" the college in the crisis, the effect of this latest onslaught was almost disastrous. Four professors, two assistant professors, and six tutors left for better positions elsewhere. During the biennium, the department of agriculture alone had three heads in succession, thereby almost completely destroying the effectiveness of its work. When the college began filling up the vacancies with its own graduates, they, too, soon found better positions and departed forthwith.⁴⁹

Meanwhile, the college forces were not by any means retiring from the battlefield. The Jackson Clarion, the most influential paper in the state, together with a large portion of the provincial press, came valiantly to the defense of the institution.⁵⁰ In Columbus, the Index indulged in choler no less violent than Burkitt's:

Frank Burkitt, of the wool-hat, brogan-shoe, yellow-breeches, one-gallows, unwashed, uncombed, anti-improvement brigade, tried to get the State Grange to join him in his foolish and malignant opposition to all State institutions of learning, but the Grange was composed of men of brains, who refused to be led by a crank to do so foolish an act. Frank's abuse of all high officials, all professors in college, all railroad companies, and all classes who make their living otherwise than by manual labor, will never make him Governor. The poor people may be in the majority, but the poor are not all ignorant by a jug full or two, and none but the excessively ignorant believe his wonderful stories about official corruption.⁵¹

42. Chickasaw Messenger, August 11, 1887.

43. Chickasaw Messenger, April 12, 1888.

44. Minutes of the Board, March 16, 1888.

45. Chickasaw Messenger, September 15, 1887.

46. Chickasaw Messenger, August 23, 1888.

47. Chickasaw Messenger, January 29, 1888.

48. Biennial Report, 1888-89, 4; Mississippi, Laws, 1888, 5-6.

49. Minutes of the Board, March 15, 1888; Biennial Report, 1888-89, 5-6; Lee to Gov. Lowrey, October 3, 1888, President's Letter Book.

50. Jackson Weekly Clarion, July 21, 1886.

51. Quoted in Chickasaw Messenger, January 20, 1887.

Needless to say, the agricultural press generally rallied behind the college, the Southern Livestock Journal, in particular. The Journal was no blind supporter, however; for it had not failed to point out the chinks in the college armor in times past. However, when the discussion began in the mid-eighties over the value of the A. and M. College, the Journal was one of the first to cast an affirmative vote. Out-of-state newspapers were often complimentary. The Country Gentleman found the college record quite impressive.⁵² In 1885, just before Burkitt's onslaught, the St. Paul (Minnesota) Farmers' Advocate wrote:

We find as the result of our investigations, that Michigan, Mississippi and Ontario have genuine agricultural colleges, doing an efficient, satisfactory work. The Kansas and Colorado schools are almost entitled to be classed with them in this regard. In Ontario schools five hours of daily labor on the farm is required of all the students. Mississippi and Colorado three hours; Kansas one hour. Ontario is the most intensely agricultural of the list—Kansas the least so. These schools are doing good work, in the cause of agricultural education—that of Mississippi especially wonderful, though not, as yet, fully recognized and appreciated at the South.⁵³

In 1887 the Atlanta Constitution was giving the college such favorable press coverage that Burkitt sourly remarked that one of the Constitution correspondents must have "taken up his abode at the A. & M. and is devoting his great talent and facile pen to the business of booming Gen. Lee, Prof. Gully and every body and everything pertaining to our pet agricultural humbug."⁵⁴

Individuals prominent in state and national affairs lent their voices to the chorus of opposition to Burkitt's attacks. In 1887 Arthur Perkins, N. B. Crawford, a legislator, and the Rev. Thomas C. Teasdale, of Columbus, wrote enthusiastic letters to the press.⁵⁵ Also, the U. S. Commissioner of Agriculture, Norman Coleman, gave his support to the college in a published statement, which was described as "worth a thousand 'wool hat' objectors."⁵⁶

Support also came from educators. In July, 1887, at a meeting of the Northeast Mississippi Teachers' Association, one of the delegates remarked that he knew of "a candidate running for the Legislature and advocating the idea of making kindling wood out of the I. I. & C. and the A. and M. College. Now, sir, I am not in favor of any such feishness. Let us support our home institutions, and rather have more than destroy what we have."⁵⁷ Again, in 1883, Professor J. W. A. Wright, of the Alabama Normal College, was writing that he knew of "no A. and M. College of any State that has so nearly carried out the letter and spirit of the law establishing them, and so successfully adapted the labor system for its students, as had Gen. Lee's."⁵⁸

It was from the farm that the strongest volume of praise for the college was heard, and that despite the fact that Burkitt boasted that he was championing the interests of the tax-oppressed farmers in his assault on the institution. In March, 1886, just a few months after the great Burkitt offensive began, the Clarion published a letter from "Old Boots," who staunchly defended the colleges at both Starkville and Columbus.⁵⁹ When the Grange met in December, the college forces were there in full panoply, General Lee himself making one of the major addresses.⁶⁰ In his talk Lee admitted that a few of the critics of the college were Grangers. Moreover, it does seem that Burkitt's poison had done some damage, for a resolution which reputedly endorsed the A. and M. College and the I. I. & C. appears to have been tabled.⁶¹ Nevertheless, the Grange soon filled the breach admirably. In 1887 the Grange published a full account of the Patrons' record of friendship for the college under the title, The State Grange and A. & M. College. The most effective blow against Burkitt was administered by his own Chickasaw County Grange, which met in July, 1887, with Lee and Gully as guests.⁶² Here resolutions were passed recognizing the college as "one of, if not the very best, of its kind in the United States, thus proving it to be a success." Moreover, the Chickasaw Grange endorsed the college as being well managed and worthy of a "proper appropriation" from the next legislature.⁶³ When, in 1888, Burkitt attended the annual meeting of the Patrons' Union at Lake and launched a bitter tirade against the college, W. C. Wellborn, an alumnus of the institution, arose to defend the school amid "frequent and enthusiastic cheering."⁶⁴

Meanwhile, the Farmers' Alliance, which effected its first state organization in the summer of 1887, also proved to be a sturdy champion of the A. and M. cause. Injecting a new element into the college financial controversy, the Alliance appointed a committee to "investigate the obligation of indebtedness due on the part of the State to the several State educational institutions." It was here that the University entered the conflict; for between the lines of this mysterious resolution

52. Southern Livestock Journal, June 17, 1886.

53. Quoted in the Jackson Weekly Clarion, November 11, 1885.

54. Chickasaw Messenger, December 8, 1887.

55. Jackson Weekly Clarion, February 23, 1887.

56. Chickasaw Messenger, March 24, 1887.

57. Jackson Clarion, July 27, 1887.

58. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, September 6, 1888.

59. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, March 3, 1886.

60. Jackson Weekly Clarion, December 29, 1886.

61. Chickasaw Messenger, February 10, 1887.

62. Chickasaw Messenger, September 1, 1887.

63. Jackson Weekly Clarion, August 24, 1887.

64. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, August 2, 1888.

was an attack on Ole Miss. As compared to the other state colleges, the University had been living off the fat of the treasury, thanks to a settlement in 1880 whereby the state had recognized a supposed indebtedness of over a half million to the Seminary Fund of 1819 and had agreed to pay 6% annually (\$32,643, 67) to the University as settlement. The Alliance Committee obtained a wordy opinion from Senator J. Z. George, a member of the A. and M. Board of Trustees, to the effect that the state had no real obligation of indebtedness to the Seminary Fund, and had, as of January 1, 1879 overpaid its interest due to the extent of \$13,535.68.

While the University was living in relative ease in the eighties with its annual \$32,000 in interest payments, the A. and M. College had been receiving only \$4,928.50, or one-half the interest on the land scrip bonds, which were serving the two state agricultural colleges solely as an endowment, the remainder of the cost of operation having to be furnished by the state. George pointed out further that in accepting the land grant college donation from the federal government, the state had obligated itself to contribute funds to operate the school, whereas there had been no such stipulation in the Seminary Fund donation.⁶⁵

The reaction to the George statement and the Alliance Committee Report was immediate. In December, 1887, the State Grange added its bit of fuel to the fire by raising the question of the University debt and demanding an adequate appropriation for A. and M. College.⁶⁶ Meanwhile, Burkitt, who so far had more or less admitted the University's right to exist, now gleefully joined the assault on the Ole Miss phalanx, modestly assuming for himself and his "Weel Hat idea" the credit for what was happening.⁶⁷ In a sense, Senator George had stolen some of Burkitt's demagogic thunder, for in defending the A. and M. College as opposed to the University George had praised the land-grant scheme as being intended to benefit "the great mass of the people, those who, by industry and skill create our great wealth, which is mostly, I am sorry to add, enjoyed by others," while the "seminary grants" went for the erection of colleges and universities "for the nonindustrial classes, or those who in common parlance, are well to do in the world, if not rich, for the education of our professional men, and gentlemen of fashion and society."⁶⁸

At last the fat was in the fire again in the old controversy between the University and the agricultural college. Ole Miss had never forgotten the humiliation it had received when the agricultural and mechanical training provided under the Morrill Act had been taken from it in 1870, and apparently it had enjoyed the financial tribulations of A. and M. during the Burkitt era with none-too-sad a countenance, the university's income being assured by the settlement of 1880. It was true that Chancellor Stewart, at an A. and M. commencement in 1882 had made an impromptu speech asserting that he saw no reason for any "particle of jealousy" between the two state institutions. But there had been great rivalry over enrollment, especially after the county-quota scheme had served to place A. and M. in an unfavorable position. There had also been financial rivalry. In 1886, while the appropriation quarrel was at its height, we find Lee writing to a legislator from Oktibbeha County that the college was putting its hope in the "farmer boys," who had never had a chance against "the boys from our cities & towns, in the lace at Oxford." In the same letter Lee complained that while the enrollment at Starkville was twice as large as that at Oxford, "we get about the same thing."⁶⁹ Finally, when George's attack on the University support funds appeared, Lee could not restrain himself. He wrote the Senator that the State owed him a great debt, particularly because in recent years Lee had felt that the friends of Ole Miss had been "aiding in establishing a strong undercurrent against this institution."⁷⁰

Meanwhile, Burkitt and Lee were engaged in a battle for the support of the farming interests, particularly the Grange and the Alliance. One of Lee's chief devices was to invite investigation by both farmer organizations and private individuals. In the summer of 1898, A. E. Flugler, a member of the Grange, visited the campus and returned to write a lengthy recantation of whatever he had said against the college as one formerly "tainted with the 'weel hat' idea." Flugler's conclusion was that the criticism levelled at the college was the work of "specious demagogues" who distorted facts and attempted to appeal to the prejudices of "class" under the "false pretenses of reform."⁷¹

Lee also took a turn at propaganda, writing a lengthy series of articles, which appeared in the press and were eventually published in pamphlet form in 1889.⁷² Here was the antidote to Burkitt's Weel-Hat pamphlet. Lee pointed out that while the college consumed state funds, so did a number of other state agencies; that in the student

65. Chickasaw Messenger, September 6, 1887.

66. Chickasaw Messenger, December 23, 1887.

67. Chickasaw Messenger, October 13, 1887.

68. Ibid., September 6, 1887.

69. Lee to T. B. Carroll, January 12, 1886, President's Letter Book.

70. Lee to J. Z. George, October 8, 1887, President's Letter Book.

71. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, June 14, 1888.

72. S. D. Lee, The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Mississippi, Jackson, 1889.

appointment matter, A. and M. had been more representative in its distribution of students than had the University; that the college was not a haven of rich men's sons, as had been charged; that farmers' sons were usually more than 89% of the student body; that professors' salaries were disgracefully low rather than extravagantly high; that nearly half the graduates were engaged in agricultural activities; that it was not the fault of the college that its location in Oktibbeha county made it possible for a large number of local day-students to attend; that while private colleges might be cheaper to operate, they were not equipped to give practical training; and that far from being a leach on the common school funds, the college served as a necessary force for leadership in elevating the common schools, no state ever having built up a strong public school system without having at the top a strong collegiate system.

Lee seems not to have missed an important meeting of either the Grange or the Alliance. In fact, he apparently maintained membership in both. In November, 1886, he had attended and addressed a farmers meeting at Breehaven, the purpose of which seems to have been to organize the state Alliance.⁷³ In September, 1888, he was listed as "a leading spirit at the convention" of the Alliance in that year.⁷⁴

Lee's reward for his pains was seen manifest. The Oktibbeha Alliance, after sending a committee to inspect the college, passed favorable resolutions. In the August, 1888, state meeting a "very complimentary resolution" was introduced favoring both A. and M. and the I. I. and C. Again, in 1889, the Alliance convention was apparently well under Lee's influence, even though some local units, notably that of Utica, still remained cool toward the college. Arrangements were made in 1889 to memorialize the legislature concerning the demands of the Alliance, and a committee consisting of Lee and Guerry, a staunch supporter of the college, prepared the memorial.⁷⁵ In the meanwhile, Lee had improved his position considerably by a decision to enter state politics.

The General first began to toy with the idea of running for office in 1887. At that time he seems to have been imbued with a considerable reform spirit, and the influence of the politically-minded Alliance seems to have spurred him on. In June rumors were afloat that Lee would be a candidate for governor two years hence. The Lee County Standard seems to have initiated the Lee boom with a journalistic "nomination."⁷⁷ Soon other papers were joining in, including the Oktibbeha Citizen, and the Columbus Dispatch. Burkitt, of course, unleashed all manner of ridicule upon Lee, accusing him of taking the stump "in behalf of his College" in a "politics-financial canvass."⁷⁹

During the next two years Lee's candidacy seemed more and more likely. From all classes there arose demands that he run, either for the Governorship or for the Senate. A "Farmer" wrote in his favor, pointing out that Lee was "one of the few men who pointed our people to the prosperity of this day. To him the farmers, and all classes of the State, are due profoundest acknowledgments for his able and patriotic direction when the laboring classes of the State were oppressed and degraded."⁸⁰ The Meridian Free Press on March 29, 1889 reported that the "Alliance people" were backing Lee's candidacy "because he is the farmers friend. They knew he is sincere in his desire to help the industrial classes." Then, referring to reports that the "Big Felks" had found only seven men in Lauderdale county for Lee, the Free Press averred: "Well, they are too big, you know, to see the people. The people are for Lee."⁸¹ Letters to the editor appeared all over the state: from "A Democrat to the Backbone," who wanted to remove Lee from "the narrow confines of the A. & M. College;" from "The Mighty East," which pledged that part of the state to him; from "R," who felt that Lee would "unite all classes of our citizens in one industrial progressive movement;" from an "Old Soldier," who was again ready to fight for his general; and from "One of the Old 4th," who had served under Lee and felt that he would be "the right man in the right place." According to a pencilled notation found in Blewitt Lee's Scrapbook, the last of these letters was the work of Dr. Magruder, Professor of English at the college.⁸²

In the early months of 1889, Lee finally openly announced his willingness to become a candidate for governor. In February, N. C. Guerry, one of Lee's first successful graduate farmers, announced that the General was willing for his name to be placed in nomination, although he was no office-seeker, was happy enough in his work at the college, and would not consent to make a canvass of the state in a "hunt after votes."⁸³ In April Lee himself wrote a letter repeating the statements of Guerry and announcing that while he would accept the nomination, he could not "neglect" his work at the college to engage in politicking.⁸⁴ Meanwhile, a number of newspapers were urging Lee to desist on the ground that he was needed at the college, and the College Reflector wailed that the loss of the General would "strike almost a death blow at one of the grandest

73. Southern Livestock Journal, November 18, 1886.
 74. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, September 6, 1888.
 75. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, July 26, 1888;
Chickasaw Messenger, August 30, 1888.
 76. Chickasaw Messenger, March 21, 1889;
Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, January 30, 1890.
 77. Chickasaw Messenger, June 9, 1887; Lee County Standard, July 2, 1887 (Blewitt Lee Scrapbook, I).

79. Chickasaw Messenger, September 15, 1887.
 80. Clipping in Blewitt Lee Scrapbook, I.
 81. Blewitt Lee Scrapbook, III.
 82. Blewitt Lee Scrapbook, I.
 83. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, February 14, 1889.
 84. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, May 2, 1889.

institutions of the south."⁸⁵

On June 15, 1889, Lee spoke at Columbus, in what was regarded as the opening speech of his campaign. Paying tribute to the work and ideals of the Farmers' Alliance, and championing most of the Alliance program except free silver and the co-operative warehouse scheme, with which ideas he apparently was not in sympathy, Lee pled for state unity and economic expansion:

The people have been giving too much attention to politics; they are divided on many questions, and I have been led to believe that I, better than any other man in the State can unite them. I have given the subject of industrial development of the State more study and attention than most men in the State, and I believe I know and appreciate her wants and needs.⁸⁶

That Lee was now in dead earnest was obvious. In fact, it was announced at the Columbus meeting that after commencement, Lee would make appointments and "enter the canvass in earnest."⁸⁷

Meanwhile, the Board of Trustees had become alarmed. In fact, this was not the first scare Lee had given them during the years of the Burkitt attack. In March, 1888, after the legislature had drastically reduced his budget and cut his own salary, Lee threatened to resign. In the following year, tempting offers had come to him from Tennessee and Georgia, at salaries far above his Mississippi pittance. In 1890 he was to receive a tempting offer from Clemson.⁸⁸

On June 17, 1889 four members of the board, Montgomery, George, Street, and Peets, wrote Lee imploring him to give up his candidacy and remain at the college. With considerable reluctance the General yielded.⁸⁹ Three months later the executive committee, taking the bull by the horns, increased Lee's salary from \$2000 to \$3000, subject to the approval of the full board. Spurred on by the offer from Clemson the following spring, the trustees ultimately gave their consent, a legislative enactment to the contrary notwithstanding.⁹⁰

The next decade brought triumph for Lee in his battle with the critics of the college. In 1890, after having been invited to no avail for several years, the Alliance finally met on the college campus. Before adjourning, it adopted resolutions to the effect that "the thanks of the farmers as well as the people of Mississippi are due to Gen. S. D. Lee for the efficient and able manner in which he had developed the A. & M. College." His refusal to take the lucrative offer of Clemson was warmly commended. The Alliance then detailed the sundry miseries which Lee and his college had suffered: the unsatisfactory agricultural college experiments in other states during that period; the handicaps in getting started with inadequate facilities and extremely impoverished lands to cultivate as a college farm; the appropriation laws; the difficulty of obtaining instructors capable of doing agricultural teaching; and the endless annoyance of carping critics. In conclusion, the Alliance resolved to use "all honorable means to maintain and support said institution so that it may be carried to the highest state of efficiency and perfection."⁹¹ When the Alliance reconvened in 1891, the campus was again the meeting place, and, of all people, Frank Burkitt, who was then State Lecturer, attended and made one of the principal speeches.⁹²

By 1896, Lee could say that opposition had "about ceased."⁹³ Whether Burkitt and Lee had now concluded to bury the hatchet elsewhere than in each other is doubtful. At any rate, the old bitterness was apparently on the wane by this time. Actually, the two men had many views in common on the issue of reform. In fact, in the Constitutional Convention of 1890, to which he was elected by Oktibbeha County, Lee was no less prominent than Burkitt in advocating reform measures, the most sensational one sponsored by the General being woman suffrage.⁹⁴ However, Lee apparently deserted the Alliance when in the early nineties it went into politics as the Populist Party, with Frank Burkitt as its leading figure. For example, in 1893, when the Populists were hotly demanding cheap money, we find Lee in an address to the student body and the Starkville citizenry on the "depressed condition of the farming interest in Mississippi," speaking in favor of a "stable and reliable currency," and calling on the farming interests to make use of agricultural education and common sense to diversify their crops and employ sound methods of cultivation.⁹⁵

In the nineties legislative appropriations were still low. A slight rise was allowed in 1890, more, in fact, than the opposition had intended to allow the college.⁹⁶

85. Clippings in Blewitt Lee Scrapbook, I.

86. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, June 29, 1889

87. Idem.

88. Minutes of the Board, June 16, 1890.

89. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, June 27, 1889

90. Minutes of the Board, September 19, 1889; June 16, 1890.

91. The New Farmer, August 13, 1890 (in Blewitt Lee Scrapbook, I.)

92. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, August 20, 1891

93. Biennial Report, 1894-1895, 4.

94. Oktibbeha Citizen, July 17, 1890.

95. Quoted in an unidentified Starkville newspaper, November 10, 1893, a clipping from which appears in Blewitt Lee Scrapbook, I.

96. Biennial Report, 1890-1891.

After a very small increase in 1892, there was a considerable decrease in the next two biennia, largely because of the depression following the panic of 1893.⁹⁷ Meanwhile, Lee never seems to have tired in his efforts to impress the legislature with the needs of the college. He was invariably to be found in Jackson when the legislature met, "not as a lobbyist, but to look after the interests of his college, and see that it is properly represented before the legislative committees;" and on at least one occasion, he appeared before the House of Representatives to outline the needs of the institution.⁹⁸

In 1890 the federal government came to the aid of the college by diverting certain proceeds from the sale of public lands to be used for "instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language, and the various branches of mathematics, natural and economic sciences, with special reference to their applications in the industries of life and the facilities for such instruction." The state's share of this fund, which was eventually to total \$25,000 annually, was at first split equally with Alcorn, but the Secretary of the Interior finally forced a division on the basis of educable children of the white and black race, with the result that Alcorn received nearly six-tenths of the annual income.⁹⁹ Subsequently, the Federal government donated an entire township of land as "additional endowment" for the college.¹⁰⁰

In the mid-nineties the political bee began to swarm about Lee's bonnet again. The critics of the college were once more threatening to cut appropriations.¹⁰¹ There was talk of running the General for governor, and some supporters were recommending him as a Congressional candidate. Apparently Lee would have yielded this time and entered the gubernatorial canvass, had it not been for the failing health of his wife, for whose sake he withdrew from the race in June, 1895.¹⁰² Subsequently, the aging General did, however, accept a position on the Vicksburg Memorial Park Commission. Soon this new work was consuming so much of his time that Lee determined to resign from the presidency of the college. He continued, nevertheless, to keep his eye on college affairs, serving on the board from 1900 until his death in 1908.¹⁰³

Lee's retirement from the presidency was widely lamented. Perhaps no one was more loud in his wailing than H. Dent Minor, one of Lee's "boys" of the first graduating class, one who, by the way, had made himself into a lawyer rather than a practical farmer:

Your boys, General, have a right to a voice in this matter and their feelings can't be entirely disregarded. And if a vote were taken and the proposed change depended on the result of that vote, you would never become a commissioner....

The man who won fame in fighting for the Confederacy has my admiration. But he is of small importance when compared to the man who has made the A. & M. College. One showed bravery, courage, skill, and a certain kind of patriotism; the other has shown a generous nobility and a patriotism of the highest and purest kind. -- Both are superior to any park commissioner that ever lived or will live even though you may become one.¹⁰⁴

Although Lee had been beset by more perils than the fabled Pauline, there can be little doubt that in the end the General's two decades had accomplished, as the General liked to say, a veritable "revolution" in state agriculture. In fact, Lee's A. and M. College had even changed the character of many a supposed sluggard, if we are to accept the verdict of the East Mississippi Times:

We notice, with special satisfaction, the influence of the A. & M. College on this community and especially on the young men of the community who have attended the College. These young men, almost to a man, have gone to work, hard work in the hot summer weather we have had since Commencement. It is now a fact observed by our citizens that there are fewer loafers on our streets than were ever seen there before at this time of year. The loafing business is likely to die out for want of material....

Certainly the college had contributed to the development of Oktibbeha County, even though in a fit of rage in 1887, Burkitt had quoted statistics to prove that property valuations had declined in the county since 1880.¹⁰⁵ But on the positive side, there was the gradual promotion of practical farming in Oktibbeha County, particularly dairying, which was seen, through college auspices, to make Oktibbeha County the Jersey Center of the United States.

A picture of the "revolution" wrought by the College in its own neighborhood was given by a correspondent of the Southern Farmer, J. Burruss McGehee:

97. Mississippi, Laws, 1892, 11-12; 1894, 11-12; 1896, 11.
98. New Orleans Picayune, January 12, 1894; Blewitt Lee, Scrapbook, I.
99. Biennial Report, 1880-1881, 5-6.
100. Biennial Report, 1894-1895, 9.
101. Jackson Weekly Clarion-Ledger, February 13, 1895.
102. Columbus Dispatch, June 10, 1895 (Blewitt Lee Scrapbook, I).
103. Commercial Appeal, March 24, 1900.
104. H. Dent Minor to Lee, February 25, 1899 (Blewitt Lee Scrapbook, III).
105. Chickasaw Messenger, February 24, 1887.

The wonderful transformation of the territory contiguous to the college for many miles radius, in every direction from the college as a centre, is truly marvelous. The galled and seamed scarred and torn hills, that formerly faced the visitor on every side, have given place to a beautiful landscape, presenting a most attractive scene of agricultural and horticultural development.

Beautiful plots of small fields of alfalfa and vetch, from a foot to fourteen inches high, of luxuriant growth and perfect developments (without inoculation), greet the eye in several directions. The neat flower plats contribute to the perfection of the landscape.

The attractive and handsome college grounds, laid out with good taste and well improved in every direction, crown a rounded hill top, and the ordered plats of planted and growing crops, winter crops now in beautiful form, and the smooth, well-prepared areas ready for planting and planted, all offer object lessons to the coming farmer of Mississippi's less favored localities and less bountiful soils which are simply inestimable in value to present and future generations.

No one once acquainted with former conditions in the surrounding territory could realize the transformation that has occurred under the wise administration that has guided the Agricultural and Mechanical College these past years...¹⁰⁶

Some indication of how the college in its own pervasive manner had begun a gradual revolution in the life of the state is seen in an article appearing in a Copiah County paper, sometime in the late eighties or early nineties. Replying to the critics who maintained that the college had not benefitted the farmers, the newspaper commented:

It was not expected that this institution would revolutionize the State, but that its effects upon the farmers would be gradual, but sure. It could test new methods, improved machinery, and experiment as to the best stock for this country. Already we see a great change in this county. A few years ago not a Holstein, a Jersey or a Devon or any improved breed of cattle could be found in this county. Many of our farmers sent their boys to the college, and they learned the great advantages of such stock, learned the most profitable way in which they should be cared for, and they have induced their parents to improve their cattle. This they have done, and today our county is filling up with Jerseys, Holstein, etc. In this immediate neighborhood there are found Jersey bulls, besides a large number of half breeds of both sexes, while before the establishment of the college there were none. Major B.F. Nelson has a pair of imported Holsteins and is thinking seriously of getting a separator. All this is due to the influence of his grandson, Flowers Nelson, who has attended the college and learned the great advantages of improved over scrub stock.¹⁰⁷

The exemplary effect of the A. and M. College in its first two decades can hardly be minimized. No "revolution" was produced in Mississippi agriculture, of course. Indeed, a revolution would, like most sudden revolutions, have been too much of a flash in the pan. Lee's reform could be defined as evolutionary rather than revolutionary in character. In his own deliberate way, the General had set out to change the agricultural face of Mississippi. He had followed the Bourbons and the New Southerners in an attack on the one-crop system, in their pleas for diversification and scientific cultivation, and in their efforts to attract desirable immigrants from the North to replace the migratory Negro. He had favored agriculture over mechanical training when the college was new and financially weak, but he had not turned a deaf ear to the mechanics who demanded the establishment of an engineering course in 1892.

Lee was never afraid of expanding the activities of the college. He had even established graduate work on the campus as early as 1883, when two years of advanced work in chemistry, biology, horticulture, mathematics, and agriculture were offered. Interestingly enough, this first graduate program contained a humanistic leaven in the form of the required course in "English Prose and Poetry... Logic and Mental Science."¹⁰⁸ The thesis involved in this work was to be on "some subject connected with (the) industrial or scientific course."¹⁰⁹ Other graduate courses were introduced in the nineties, including veterinary science and mechanic arts, and some consideration was made of offering courses in history and civics.¹¹⁰ In 1897, the faculty revised the residence requirements to "not less than one year," added a "reading knowledge" of either French, Spanish, German, or Latin, and provided for major and minor fields in each graduate program.¹¹¹ Actually, so far the school's graduate program was designed largely to enable men seeking mere technical training to continue their studies, usually in a teaching capacity, meanwhile

106. Blewitt Lee, Scrapbook, III.

107. Blewitt Lee, Scrapbook, III.

108. Minutes of the Faculty, October 22, November 19, 1883.

109. Catalogue, 1889-1890, 26.

110. Minutes of the Faculty, April 10, 17, 1893.

111. Minutes of the Faculty, March 18, 29, 1896; Catalogue, 1898-1899, 30.

preparing themselves as experiment station specialists, chemists, and professors of agriculture. A number of these post-graduate products remained to become full-fledged members of the A. and M. faculty, particularly in the lean years when the more experienced members of the staff were fleeing to better positions in other states; others made names for themselves outside the state. Among these "masters" were: H. H. Harington, who became Professor of Chemistry at Texas A. and M. College; J. F. Dugger, who became Professor of Agriculture at Auburn; B. Irby, who became Professor of Agriculture at North Carolina Agricultural and Mechanical College; J. H. Connell, who became head of the Texas Experiment Station; and B. W. Kilgore, who became State Chemist in North Carolina. Among those who cast their lot with the College were: Buzz Walker, whom Lee made a professor of mathematics; J. M. White, whom Lee made Professor of History and Civics; A. B. McKay, Lee's professor of horticulture; W. B. Stark, who was to return under Hardy as a mathematics professor; W. C. Wellborn, whom Lee made Professor of Agriculture; G. C. Creelman, a graduate of the University of Toronto, who became biology professor; B. W. Saffold, who for a short time headed the college horticulture department; W. L. McGee, whom Lee made assistant experiment station director; J. S. Herbert, who remained to head the preparatory department; J. W. Fox, who became Professor of Mathematics and taught Civil and Rural Engineering; J. S. Carroll, who became an assistant in chemistry; W. R. Perkins, who under Hardy became professor of agronomy; W. F. Hand, who remained to become head of the chemistry department and State Chemist; J. S. Moore, who eventually became head of the dairy husbandry department; J. S. Weir, who taught mechanic arts; and E. F. Ferris, whom Lee made Assistant Chemist at the experiment station. A number of other graduate students, who began under Lee, were later to take positions at the college under Lee's successors. There were I. D. Sessums, C. R. Stockard, J. E. McKell, C. E. Ard, D. C. Hull, R. C. Carpenter, and Hugh Critz.

All told, Lee was certainly the man who in all its existence made the deepest imprint upon the college. He at times made errors of judgment. He was at times far too meddlesome in the affairs of the departments; but we must remember that in Lee's day the college was small—a sort of family affair, headed by a patriarch who knew his own mind even if he could not comprehend others. Perhaps in the formative years strong and uncompromising leadership was indispensable. The uproar that arose whenever Lee threatened to resign was certainly no stage-managed demonstration. Apparently both students and faculty regarded the General as indispensable to the welfare of the college—and so did Lee. The college was his mission in life, and to it he gave his best years. It took a man imbued with considerable of the missionary spirit to reject a salary nearly double the pittance offered him by impoverished Mississippians. Thus, preaching the gospel of scientific agriculture, he was able to build a model college with a model farm on the site of "one of the poorest and most worn-out cotton plantations in the South."¹¹²

112. Newspaper clipping in Blewitt Lee, Scrapbook, III.

THE NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE EXAMINES CITY FINANCES

The Federal Government is steadily moving into the field of municipal affairs because the states have defaulted on their responsibility to serve local communities adequately, Mayor Albert D. Cash of Cincinnati told a meeting of the Annual National Conference on Government on Nov. 20. The conference was sponsored by the National Municipal League. Cash declared that the only way in which many cities can now obtain assistance in providing local services is by dealing directly with Washington and by-passing reluctant State Legislatures. "Until the states as such assume their proper responsibilities," Mayor Cash said, "we may expect the entry of the Federal Government into more and more fields of activity because the activities in which it engages are those demanded by the people, and they are not being performed by the proper unit of government." Mr. Cash cited housing, street construction, public buildings, airports and schools as examples of fields in which Washington was now dealing directly with American cities. He said that most mayors have a universal dislike for accepting this aid but do so because "the states have almost completely defaulted in the function which is appropriately theirs." Mayor Cash asserted that the states "must be goaded into assuming their proper responsibilities, and the communities must be prepared to solve their own problems. If this happens, he predicted, it will be unnecessary for Washington to extend its local control and the Federal Government would be able to relinquish many of the functions which are needed but which would not now be performed by it except for the vacuum created by the states."

A warning against over-specialization in government was made by Dr. Roscoe C. Martin, head of the political science department at Syracuse University and past president of the American Society for Public Administration. He cautioned the league members that citizen organizations devoted to lobbying for a single cause had weakened the overall efficiency of government by inciting competition among bureaus and agencies for money and power. Unlike several other speakers, he said politicians were valuable for their "generalist" approach to civic problems. Dr. Martin praised the "generalist" approach of the city manager form of municipal government, declaring that this official "knows less about some things but more about many things."

NOTES

EXTRACTS AND ABSTRACTS

Home Economics in Family Life Education

by

ESTHER F. SEGNER

Head, Homemaking Education Department

(NOTE: The following paper was delivered by Miss Segner before the Mississippi Home Economics Association at Jackson, on Nov. 3.)

Family Life Education is concerned with the promotion of (1) wholesome relationships within the family, (2) better and more wholesome growth and development of individual family members, and (3) more wholesome relationships between family and community. Briefly stated, it requires a better background of sociology, psychology, psychology, anthropology and economics than most of us in home economics have at our command.

We are well versed in the concerns of home economics but it might do well to take a backward look at the ideas set forth by our founders. Looking backward to the Lake Placid Conference in 1899, we find that our founder, Ellen R. Richards, guided many of the discussions by asking such questions as these:

What are the essentials which must be retained in a house if it is to be the home? What work must be done outside? What standards must be maintained within? How can the schools be made to help? What instruction should go into the curriculum of the lower schools, and what is the duty of the higher educational and professional schools? What forces in the community can be roused to action to secure for the coming race the benefits of material progress?

Mrs. Richards had a very broad interest in homemaking as a means to healthful and happy living. Being a chemist, by profession, she was extremely interested in sanitation and the promotion of personal and public health. Being interested in having as much leisure time as possible in which to share her home, she learned and taught, by example--that best of all methods--how to arrange house furnishings simply and effectively for ease in house care. A few years before her death (1911) she persuaded librarians to classify Home Economics (according to their Dewey Decimal system) under Economics of Consumption rather than under Production in order to suggest that home economics involves vital matters connected with social economy as well as with the arts of cooking and sewing.

She recognized that homes cannot adjust themselves to rapidly changing conditions without the help of trained people and urged the placing of home economics on a sound education and scientific basis.

Much of what Ellen H. Richards and her co-founders of the American Home Economics movement hoped for has come to pass. If she could observe what has come about in the past forty years she would recognize that our professional schools and our research people have attained status and have made fine contributions to scientific literature in our field. Many trained home economists have become leaders of adults and of children through Extension Programs; some are teaching better ways of living under the auspice of industrial firms. Still others are teaching and interpreting certain aspects of homemaking in hospitals, welfare agencies, and in nursery schools. Many a family owes the good quality of its family and community relationships to the home economics training of the mother. And the rest of us are teachers!

Mrs. Richards might be surprised to find how many trained women are combining homemaking and wage earning, just as she did so successfully. She would find changing goals in American education with considerably more stress on child nurture and on mental hygiene. She would find that home economics is offered in a large per cent of public secondary schools--but in few private schools at this level. There is much interest in home economics teaching in elementary grades, but actually little is being taught. In some states, possibly not in Mississippi, by far the largest percentage of pupils taking home economics are girls of average or low ability. We

give lip service to teaching boys and men but actually are doing very little of it. In a recent study in N.Y. State, we found that in 41 high schools there were 150 units in personal and family living being offered to boys and girls in 21 subjects other than homemaking.

In the community many youth-serving and family-serving agencies are teaching children and parents how to improve their family living. Going back to our N. Y. study again, we found that children knew more about good family living when their mothers belonged to Home Bureau units (Home Demonstration), and when they and their fathers belonged to at least one local club or other organization.

For the Family Life conference held in Washington in 1947, there were 125 sponsoring organizations of which the American Home Economics Association was one.

Are we losing ground or has the body of subject matter become too complex for us? I believe the latter to be true. In a recent talk at a national meeting of school administrators, Lawrence K. Frank made this statement, "The need for education in home and family living is generally recognized. There is, however, no clarity about meeting this need, nor agreement upon who is responsible for articulating the content and focusing the efforts that are essential....To conduct education for home and family living, the schools need the assistance and participation of various professions and agencies....This calls for new patterns of collaboration which many schools have not learned to use."

In many of our secondary schools home economics teachers have been at the head of the procession in "teaching by doing" and of demanding and using homelike equipment and methods. As a result, even with relatively lower ability pupils, we have succeeded in helping them in their everyday problem solving. If, through teaching functionally in the different areas of homemaking, we help people in developing basic mental activities in: (1) Analysis and organization of observed experiences, (2) Drawing of inference, (3) Development of inventiveness, we shall have helped them to live effectively in the present and face changes in the future.

Dr. Eduard Lindeman has given us some criteria for gauging the reality of problems we select. He suggests six elements around which family strengths are built: (1) There is a fair division of labor and it is taken for granted that each member will play his part. (2) Open budgets are openly arrived at. (3) Unity rather than uniformity is an important goal. It is often unity through diversity. (4) A sense of unity is both consciously and critically cultivated. (5) There is a genuine perspective of humor. (6) There is preparation to face the inevitabilities of life, including tragedy.

To what extent are we teaching to these strengths? We home economists cannot be all things to all families. But we can collaborate with our administrations, with overall curriculum makers, with other teachers, and with other community agencies to help families build strengths which will help them to live fully and to survive.

We can make studies which will help us to know better what real family problems are and to read reports of other studies which will help us better to interpret to children and adults their findings and implications for better living.

Many of Ellen H. Richards' questions are still unanswered. They will always have to be answered at a given time and place in history. But we do know that, as Linderman has so well said, "The family is the clue to all other varieties of human relationships, even those associated with the issues of international peace". And we know, too, that home economists have a real opportunity to help families learn to live better and more happily.

Mississippi Prices and Business Activity

SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER, 1950

The Mississippi State College Business Research Station's index of general business activity in Mississippi showed upward trends during September and October, while the Experiment Station's Farm Research reports that prices received by Mississippi farmers for their products continued an upward trend in September but declined slightly in October.

Business in Mississippi during September was 12 per cent above the level of September, 1949, according to the Mississippi Business Review. State business activity for October 1950 was 14 per cent above that for October 1949, and 12 per cent above that of September 1950.

According to D. W. Parvin, W. E. Christian, and T. E. Tramel, who have made the farm price studies for the Experiment Station, prices received by Mississippi farmers during September increased 9 per cent over August and .29 per cent over a year ago. This is the highest index of prices received recorded, surpassing the previous high in December, 1947 by 11 points. The rapid rise in recent months in the price of cotton and cotton-seed, which normally contributes above two-thirds of Mississippi's cash farm income, accounts for the greater part of this increase. Prices received by farmers of the United States as a whole have not increased as rapidly as prices received by Mississippi farmers.

Prices paid by farmers increased 1 point from August to September. However, the index of prices paid by farmers of 259 per cent of the 1909-14 average represents an increase of 8 per cent over September 1949. Since prices received increased more than prices paid, both Mississippi farmers and United States farmers as a whole were in a more favorable position than in August or a year ago.

Prices received by the Mississippi farmer during October dropped 11 points from the record high of 325 in September. This is the same index as that of December 1947, which was the highest on record until September. The drop of 11 index points represents a decrease of 3 per cent from September. Compared to October 1949, however, prices received by Mississippi farmers were 27 per cent higher. Meanwhile, prices received by farmers of the United States as a whole decreased 1 per cent from September. Prices paid by farmers during October were 6 per cent higher than during October 1949, but the same as during September 1950.

Prices received having decreased slightly and prices paid remaining unchanged, compared to September, both the Mississippi farmer and farmers of the United States as a whole were in a slightly less favorable position. However, both were in a more favorable position than during October 1949.

The Revised Public Affairs Curriculum

Three specialized professional curricula in the field of public affairs were authorized for the Business School at a recent meeting of the Administrative Council. Supplementing already existing majors in public administration, the new courses of study offer training in foreign service, pre-professional social service, and general public affairs. The new courses will be announced in the forthcoming college catalogue for the 1951-52 term. The curricula were prepared by social science departments of the Business School as members of the Social Science Council, of which Dr. John K. Bettersworth is chairman. The cooperating departments are economics, history and government, and sociology and rural life. Social science majors of a general nature are already offered by the Schools of Science and Education. The public affairs curricula involve objectives of a practical and professional nature.

The public affairs curricula were originally introduced several years ago in the School of Business and Industry in order to provide work in the general field of public administration. The present revision is designed to broaden and liberalize the program by adding training of a non-administrative nature, which will be attractive to women as well as men. The new foreign service curriculum prepares for diplomatic service, including the State Department-United Nations internship program. The major in social service is designed for students who wish to become specialists in case work, as well as for those who plan to enter specialized fields of social service. The general public affairs option is intended to train for careers in public relations, politics, and public service. "All three of the new courses of study have been developed in response to a demand on the part of the students for training in these fields," Dean Weems stated. They are one of the outgrowths of a campus-wide advisory program in public affairs and community service.

Workshop on Community Development Scheduled

Dr. Harold Kaufman, chairman of the campus-wide College Committee on Community Development at Mississippi State College, announces that on February 9th, 1951 a statewide meeting of agencies and community leaders to consider programs and problems of community development will be held at State College. At that time, community leaders will learn of the resources and services available to them and how these may be secured. The agencies, in turn, will learn of community needs and how they can best fulfill these needs. This statewide meeting dedicated to community development should be a highlight of service to communities. Extension, Experiment Station, and other

service agencies on the campus will contribute largely to the program. One of the features of the day will be a dinner meeting of the Social Science Round Table sponsored by Director L. I. Jones and the Agricultural Extension Service. The faculty is cordially invited to participate in all of the activities of the conference.

History Lecture Series Continues

Four lectures have been delivered in the series on agricultural history currently being offered by members of the History staff, under the sponsorship of the Mississippi State College student section of the American Farm Economics Association. Dr. H. S. Snellgrove spoke on October 23 on the European origins of American agriculture. On November 7, Dr. Robert A. Brent lectured on the history of agriculture in the United States. Dr. Glover Moore spoke on the agriculture of the Old South in a lecture given on November 21. On December 6, Dr. John K. Bettersworth dealt with the development of agriculture in the New South. The final lecture, on January 9, will be concerned with the history of agriculture in Mississippi. Dr. James H. McLendon will deliver this concluding talk of the series. Members of the faculty of the School of Agriculture have joined in these sessions and have contributed much to the success of the series.

Church and Community Conference Planned

Members of the Mississippi Christian Community Fellowship met at Mississippi State College, October 19, to consider projects for the coming year. The group voted to work out the program of annual Church and Community Days at Farm and Home Week, sponsor the annual recognition of churches for outstanding community service, assist in organizing a Rural Life program, and foster systematic church and community surveys and censuses. The fellowship seeks to promote Christian ideals for town and country life and to provide a means of fellowship and cooperation among town and country churches and communities.

Seminar in Agricultural History Planned

A seminar in agricultural history will be offered for the first time during the spring semester by the Department of History and Government. Graduate students, faculty members, and selected advanced undergraduates may enroll. The class will be conducted by Professor Francis V. McMillen, who has done considerable advanced study in the field of agricultural history and is now completing a dissertation on the Delta and Pine plantation. Other members of the history staff will also contribute to the seminar. Further information may be obtained from the head of the department, Dr. John K. Bettersworth.

Experiment Station Conference Concerns Social Sciences

Experiment Station workers from the entire state will meet on the campus December 11-13 for their annual conference. On Tuesday a number of group meetings will be held. Of especial interest to those in the social science field will be the group meetings in the Social Science area, with Dr. R. J. Saville, head of the department of Agricultural Economics, presiding. The social science groups, which will meet on the top floor of the Experiment Station Building, will concern themselves with present and projected research. Home Economics will be considered in the first session, at 8:30 A.M. Research in Sociology and Rural Life will be discussed from 10:15 A.M. until noon. The afternoon will be given to agricultural economics.

Economics Department Plans January Round Table

Plans for a Social Science Round Table to be held before Christmas vacation have met with difficulties in scheduling, and it has been arranged that the next meeting, which is to be sponsored by the Department of Economics, will be held on January 15. Cards announcing details of this session will be mailed out immediately after the holidays. Mr. Stefan H. Robock, Chief of the Industrial Economics Branch of the T.V.A. Regional Studies Division, will be the speaker.

Activities

Warren E. Collins, project leader of a Southern Regional Dairy Marketing Project, will make State College his headquarters during the next two years, according to Dr. Roscoe J. Saville, head of the agricultural economics department and chairman of the technical committee for the project. Mr. Collins comes from the University of Illinois, where he has been employed since 1946 as a teaching and research assistant and expects to receive his Ph.D. in 1951. This project is being carried on cooperatively by the U.S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics and by the Experiment Stations in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. Mr. Collins has already started on his field work, which will take him to all of these states. The study will center on (1) analyzing the seasonal production and utilization of dairy products, and (2) pricing of dairy products. "We are seeking a method of adjusting production to consumption each month of the year, and thus avoiding surpluses of milk part of the year and shortages the other part," says Mr. Collins.

Dean R. C. Weems attended a conference in Atlanta on November 29 on "Industrial Development and its Financing" provided for men of finance, industry, and education. The adult education department of Mississippi State College, in cooperation with the extension divisions of Georgia Tech and twelve other Southern schools, sponsored the conference. Dean Weems, who was one of the speakers on a panel discussing "Developing Markets," advocated the organization of a Southern Economic Council, to study market potentials for the region's products.

Dean R. C. Weems and Dr. Gordon K. Bryan attended a meeting of the Research Advisory Committee of the Mississippi Economic Council at Jackson, November 21. Among the items discussed was the study of municipal government, which is now under way and in which Dr. Bryan is participating. Dr. Bryan also recommended that a study of county finances be undertaken. One of the major decisions of the meeting was to invite "all research agencies, both public and private," to set up an over-all research clearing house, which would "use, more effectively, those research resources now available in the state."

Four history professors attended the meeting of the Southern History Association in Atlanta, November 9-11. They are Dr. John K. Bettersworth, Dr. Robert A. Brent, Dr. Glover Moore, and Dr. J. H. McLendon. Dr. Moore presented a paper on the Missouri controversy at this meeting. Dr. Bettersworth was a member of the Program Committee.

Two members of the history staff, Dr. Bettersworth and Dr. Harold S. Snellgrove, plan to attend the annual meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago, December 28-30.

Dr. Dorothy Dickins, head of the Mississippi Experiment Station department of home economics, presented a paper on the place of family economic research in the Experiment Station at the annual convention of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, November 14-16.

Marion T. Loftin, Assistant Professor of Sociology, spoke before the Farm Economics group at the College on November 28, using as his subject, "The Role of the Japanese in Brazilian Agriculture." Professor Loftin, whose doctoral dissertation is concerned with the Japanese in Brazil, dealt with the agricultural aspects of the São Paulo Japanese settlements, which were established during the early decades of the present century.

Professor W. W. Littlejohn attended a Federal Tax Clinic at the University of Alabama on November 27.

Professor Lee B. Gaither, head of the department of Resource-Use Education, spoke on November 14 before the Future Teachers of America at their regular monthly meeting on "What is Resource-Use Education?" Professor Gaither also attended the state Public Affairs Forum in Jackson on November 3.

On October 25-26, Dr. F. A. Rhodes attended a meeting of the Mississippi Association of School Administrators at Jackson, Mississippi. At this meeting Dr. Rhodes gave a paper on "Selecting Candidates to be Educated as Teachers."

The Korean crisis and the future of the United Nations were discussed by Professor Warren B. Scott, of the Division of Student Affairs, in an address before the Maben-Mathiston Rotary Club meeting at Wood Junior College on November 30.

Dr. Glover Moore, of the Department of History and Government, addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution of Oktibbeha County on November 2, his subject being "The United Nations." On November 10, Dr. Moore read a paper before the Southern Historical Association in Atlanta. The title of his paper was "The Northern Impulse Behind the 'Anti-Missourian' Crusade of 1819-1821."

J. V. Pace, leader in Extension Economics, participated in the National Agricultural Outlook Conference held in Washington, D. C., Oct. 30-Nov. 3. He also took part in the annual meeting of Miss. County Agents, Home Demonstration Agents, and State Extension workers at Jackson on Nov. 7-9. He attended the annual meeting of the Miss. Farm Bureau Federation at Jackson, Nov. 9-11. On Nov. 13, he spoke before the Agricultural Economics Graduate Seminar at State College on the agricultural outlook for 1951.

Dr. Harold S. Snellgrove, assistant professor of history, addressed the Newman Club at its first Sunday meeting on Nov. 12. His subject was, "Some Aspects of the Medieval Church."

Mrs. Annette Boutwell, Extension Health Education Specialist, attended the meeting of the National Home Demonstration Council at Biloxi in October. She also participated in meetings of the Home Economics Association, the Mississippi Agricultural Extension Workers, and the Farm Bureau, all three of which met in Jackson during November. Mrs. Boutwell was also selected as a State delegate to the Mid-Century White House Conference on Child Welfare held in Washington, D.C., December 3-7. She represented the Mississippi Agricultural Extension Service at the meeting. She also served as county chairman for Oktibbeha County and was a member of the State Health Committee in preparing reports for the conference.

Dr. W. H. Barnard, professor of general education and district PTA director, presided at a meeting of the Sixth District PTA at State College, on Nov. 16.

Dr. Gordon K. Bryan and Professor W. J. Evans of the government staff at Mississippi State College attended the annual convention of the Southern Political Science Association at Duke University and the University of North Carolina on Nov. 16-18. Dr. Bryan also plans to attend the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in Washington, December 28-30.

Professor W. E. Christian, Jr. of the Department of Agricultural Economics, attended a meeting of the Technical Committee of the Southern Regional Livestock Marketing Project at Birmingham, Oct. 17-18. During late September and early October Professor Christian toured the Eastern meat markets under the auspices of Swift & Co. to study the mechanics of ways in which the major part of the nation's meat is marketed. On Nov. 6 Professor Christian spoke before the conference of Extension workers at Jackson on joint research underway at State College between the Agricultural Economics Department and the Division of Sociology and Rural Life.

Four professors in the Economics Department attended a meeting of the Southern Economics Association in New Orleans Nov. 10-11: Professors Thurston Walls, William Weiner, Norman E. Weir, and Thomas A. Kelly. Topics covered at the convention included, "The Measurement of County Income;" "Accelerating and Decelerating Factors in the Economic Development of the South;" and "Foreign and Domestic Policy in Southern Agriculture."

Dr. Merle W. Myers and Mr. C. C. Carney, of the geography staff, recently attended the annual meeting of the Southeastern Association of American Geographers in Lexington, Kentucky.

Dr. Erwin H. Price, professor of modern languages, Newt F. Hamlin, associate professor of English, and Dr. R. B. Holland, assistant professor of English, attended the regional meeting of the Modern Language Association at Houston, Nov. 2-5.

This fall E R G A, a Cambridge distributing house of foreign books, entered into an agreement with Dr. Adolph Aleck, whereby he is reviewing technical German publications in psychology for professional journals.

Dr. W. P. Carter, Professor of Sociology, has recently been made a member of a committee on "The Effects of Television on the Family" to represent Mississippi in a report to the Southern Council on Family Relations, which meets in Alexandria, La. next March. On November 16, Dr. Carter addressed the PTA district conference, which met on the campus.

The staff of the Division of Sociology and Rural Life held its regular semester joint meeting with the Sociology staff of Ole Miss at Oxford on October 20.

At the request of the Chamber of Commerce of Canton, Mississippi, Dr. Gordon K. Bryan spoke to a citizens' assembly in Canton, Dec. 5, on "Some Administrative Advantages of the City Manager form of City Government."

Dr. John K. Bettersworth, who is general editor for the Mississippi Historical Commission, attended a special meeting of that group in Jackson on November 25 for the purpose of planning the historical marker program for the coming year. At that time some sixty marker sites were agreed upon. In recent weeks Dr. Bettersworth has spoken at the dedication of markers in Kosciusko and Aberdeen.

Dr. Paul H. Dunn, head of the Geology Department, participated in a meeting sponsored by the Mississippi Economic Council on November 29 to discuss the subject of Mississippi water resources and their conservation. Dr. Dunn pointed out that the water level in the state had perceptibly lowered during the past decade.

Publications

"Mississippi's Wildlife Resources" is the subject of an article prepared by Lee B. Gaither for Resource-Use News Notes, which is published by the Department of Resource-Use Education at Mississippi State College.

News for Better Health is the title of a bulletin by Mrs. Annette Boutwell, Extension Health Education Specialist, describing her work with the Choctaw and Bolivar County Health Councils. Mrs. Boutwell has also completed a new 4-H Club Health Project Book, which comes from the press in December. It has also been announced that informational releases will soon be available on the 4-County rural health practices study, in which Mrs. Boutwell has been a participant.

Looking Ahead in 1951 for Farming and Family Living is the title of a mimeographed summary of the 1951 farm and home outlook prepared by J. V. Pace, leader in Extension Economics.

The fifth edition of Dr. Adolph Aleck's Outline of Educational Psychology, written originally in collaboration with Dr. Rudolph Pintner of Columbia University, will be published by Barnes and Noble early in December.

Church and Community in Mississippi, a bulletin of the Agricultural Extension Service, gives a full report of the second annual Church and Community Conference held on the campus last July in connection with Farm and Home Week.

A Bibliography in Resource-Use Education, a 30 page bulletin in mimeographed form, has been issued by Lee B. Gaither, head of the Department of Resource-Use Education.

The October issue of Mississippi Farm Research contains an article by Dr. Harald A. Pedersen, of the Division of Sociology and Rural Life, on the subject of rural migration in Mississippi. "Boys and girls or young men and young women continue to be the most important single export from Mississippi," Dr. Pedersen says. All told, however, the result makes for a "better balance," and may, he points out, presage "a healthy readjustment in the economy of the state."

The November issue of Mississippi Farm Research gives a preliminary report on a study of cotton use in Mississippi homes conducted by Dr. Dorothy Dickins and Miss Sarah Sherrill, of the Home Economics Department.

Dr. Harold Kaufman has recently written two book reviews for professional journals. For Social Forces he reviewed Loomis and Beegle, Rural Social Systems. For Rural Sociology he reviewed Sargent, Social Psychology.

The Statistical Abstract of Mississippi, which the Business Research Station is publishing, is now ready for distribution.

Dr. John K. Bettersworth has reviewed Atherton, Southern Country Store, 1800-1860 for the Journal of Southern History; McMahon, The People of Atlanta for the same journal; and Allen, Presidents Who Have Known Me for the Journal of Mississippi History.